Universality of phase transitions of frustrated antiferromagnets

Hikaru Kawamura

Faculty of Engineering and Design
Kyoto Institute of Technology, Sakyo-ku, Kyoto 606, Japan

Recent theoretical and experimental studies on the critical properties of frustrated antiferromagnets with the noncollinear spin order, including stacked-triangular antiferromagnets and helimagnets, are reviewed. Particular emphasis is put on the novel critical and multicritical behaviors exhibited by these magnets, together with an important role played by the 'chirality'.

§1. Introduction

Phase transitions and critical phenomena have been a central issue of statistical physics for many years. In particular, phase transitions of magnets or of 'spin systems' have attracted special interest. Thanks to extensive theoretical and experimental studies, we now have rather good understanding of the nature of phase transitions of standard ferromagnets and antiferromagnets. By the term 'standard', I mean here regular and unfrustrated magnets without quenched disorder and frustration. They include ferromagnets and unfrustrated antiferromagnets with the collinear spin order.

One key notion which emerged through these studies is the notion of universality. According to the universality hypothesis, a variety of continuous (or second-order) phase transitions can be classified into a small number of universality classes determined by a few basic properties characterizing the system under study, such as the space dimensionality d, the symmetry of the order parameter and the range of interaction. If one is interested only in the so-called universal quantities, such as critical exponents, amplitude ratios and scaled equation of state, various phase transitions should exhibit exactly the same behavior. In the case of standard bulk magnets in three spatial dimensions ($d = 3$), universality class is basically determined by the number of the spin components, n. Physically, the index n is related to the type of magnetic anisotropy: Namely, $n = 1$ (Ising), $n = 2$ (XY) and $n = 3$ (Heisenberg) correspond to magnets with easy-axis-type anisotropy, easy-plane-type anisotropy and no anisotropy (isotropic magnets), respectively. The critical properties associated with these n-component $O(n)$ universality classes have been extensively studied and are now rather well understood. From the renormalization-group (RG) viewpoint, these critical properties are governed by the so-called Wilson-Fisher $O(n)$ fixed point.

1

Of course, there are a class of magnets exhibiting phase transitions very different from the standard $O(n)$ behavior. One such example may be seen in random magnets with quenched disorder. A typical example of such random magnets is a spin glass, a magnet not only random but also *frustrated*. Even in regular magnets without quenched disorder, one could expect novel transition behavior if the magnets are frustrated. In fact, the nature of phase transitions of frustrated magnets could be novel and entirely different from those of conventional unfrustrated magnets as we shall see in what follows.

(a) Frustration

Frustration could arise either from the special geometry of the lattice, or from the competition between the near-neighbor and further neighbor interactions. The former type of frustration may be seen in antiferromagnets on a two-dimensional (2D) triangular lattice or on a three-dimensional (3D) stacked-triangular (simple hexagonal) lattice, which consists of two-dimensional triangular layers stacked along an orthogonal direction. The latter type of frustration may be realized in helimagnets where magnetic spiral is formed along a certain direction of the lattice.

Spin frustration brings about interesting consequences on the resulting spin structures. As an example, let us consider three antiferromagnetically-coupled spins located at each corner of a triangle. The stable spin configurations differ depending on the type of spin symmetry, or the number of spin components n. In the case of one-component Ising spins ($n = 1$), the ground state is not uniquely determined: The situation here is illustrated in Fig.1. Frustration in the Ising case thus leads to the nontrivial degeneracy of the ordered state.

By contrast, when the spin has a continuous symmetry as in the case of vector spins such as the two-component XY ($n = 2$) and the three-component Heisenberg ($n = 3$) spins, the ground-state spin configurations become *noncollinear* or *canted*, as illustrated in Fig.2. Note that, in this case, frustration is partially released by mutual spin canting and there no longer remains a nontrivial degeneracy of the ground state up to global $O(n)$ spin rotation and reflection. In this article, we shall concentrate on this latter type of frustrated magnets with the noncollinear or canted ordered states.

(b) Chirality

One interesting consequence of such canted spin structures is the appearance of a 'chiral' degree of freedom. Let us consider, for example, the case of XY spins shown in Fig.2. If the exchange interactions are equal in magnitude on the three bonds, the ground-state spin configuration is the so-called '120° spin structure', in which three XY spins form 120° angles with the neighboring spins. As shown in Fig.2, the ground state of such triangular XY spins is two-fold degenerate according

as the resulting noncollinear spin structure is either right- or left-handed (chiral degeneracy). A given chiral state cannot be transformed into the state with the opposite chirality via any global spin rotation in the XY-spin space, global spin *reflection* being required to achieve this. One may assign a *chirality* $+$ and $-$ to each of these two ground states. In other words, the ground-state manifold of the frustrated XY magnets possess a hidden Ising-like discrete degeneracy, chiral degeneracy, in addition to a continuous degeneracy associated with the continuous XY-spin symmetry. The concept of chirality was introduced into magnetism first by Villain [1].

To characterize these two chiral states, it is convenient to introduce a scalar quantity, chirality, defined by [2]

$$\kappa_p = \frac{2}{3\sqrt{3}} \sum_{<ij>}^{p} [\vec{S}_i \times \vec{S}_j]_z = \frac{2}{3\sqrt{3}} \sum_{<ij>}^{p} (S_i^x S_j^y - S_i^y S_j^x), \qquad (1.1)$$

where the summation runs over the three directed bonds surrounding a plaquette (triangle). One can easily confirm that κ_p gives ± 1 for the two spin configurations depicted in Fig.2. Note that the chirality defined by (1.1) is a *pseudoscalar* in the sense that it is invariant under global spin rotation [SO(2)=U(1)] while it changes sign under global spin reflection [Z_2].

In the triangular spin structure formed by the n=3-component Heisenberg spins, by contrast, there is no longer a discrete chiral degeneracy since the two spin configurations in Fig.2 can now be transformed to each other by continuous spin rotation via the third dimension of the Heisenberg spin. However, one can define a chirality *vector* as an axial vector defined by [3]

$$\vec{\kappa}_p = \frac{2}{3\sqrt{3}} \sum_{<ij>}^{p} \vec{S}_i \times \vec{S}_j. \qquad (1.2)$$

The situation described above is essentially the same also in the 2D triangular and 3D stacked-triangular antiferromagnets. In the ordered state, the sublattice-magnetization vector on each sublattice (triangular layer consists of three interpenetrating triangular sublattices) cant with each other making an angle equal to $120°$. In the case of XY spins, such triangular structure gives rise to the chiral degeneracy as shown in Fig.3.

Similar chiral degeneracy is also realized in other types of canted magnets such as helimagnets (spiral magnets), in which right- and left-handed helices as illustrated in Fig.4 are energetically degenerate.

(c) Short history of research

3

Historically, studies on the critical properties of canted or noncollinear magnets was initiated more than 20 years ago for rare-earth helimagnets Ho, Dy and Tb. In 1976, Bak and Mukamel analyzed theoretically the critical properties of the paramagnetic-helimagnetic transition of easy-plane-type (XY-like) helimagnets Ho, Dy and Tb [4]. Bak and Mukamel derived an effective Hamiltonian called Landau-Ginzburg-Wilson (LGW) Hamiltonian appropriate for the XY ($n = 2$) helimagnet and performed a renormalization-group (RG) $\epsilon = 4 - d$ expansion analysis. They found a stable $O(4)$-like fixed point and claimed that Ho, Dy and Tb should exhibit a continuous transition characterized by the standard $O(4)$-like exponents $\alpha \simeq -0.17$, $\beta \simeq 0.39$, $\gamma \simeq 1.39$ and $\nu \simeq 0.70$. Note that the predicted singularity is weaker than that of the unfrustrated collinear XY magnet; namely, α is more negative while β, γ and ν are larger. Similar ϵ-expansion analysis with interest in the commensurability effect on the helical transition was also made by Garel and Pheuty [5], who found, for the case of XY ($n = 2$) spins, the same $O(4)$-like fixed point as obtained by Bak and Mukamel.

Meanwhile, experiments on rare-earth helimagnets Ho, Dy and Tb gave somewhat inconclusive results. Some of these experiments, especially neutron-diffraction measurements for Ho [6], supported the predicted $O(4)$ behavior, while some other experiments, such as specific-heat measurements for Dy [7], Mösbauer measurements for Dy [8], and neutron-diffraction measurements for Tb [9], yielded exponents significantly different from the $O(4)$ values.

A few years later, Barak and Walker reanalyzed the RG calculation by Bak and Mukamel, and found that the $O(4)$-like fixed point found by them was actually located in the region of the parameter space representing the *collinear* spin-density-wave (SDW) order, not the noncollinear helical order [10]. Since no stable fixed was found in the appropriate region in the parameter space, Barak and Walker concluded that the paramagnetic-helimagnetic transition of Ho, Dy and Tb should be first order. Although most of the experimental works on Ho, Dy and Tb done so far have reported a continuous transition, a few authors suggested that the transition of Ho and Dy might actually be weakly first order [11,12]. In fact, experimental situation concerning the critical properties of these rare-earth helimagnets has remained confused for years now, in the sense that different authors reported significantly different exponent values, or even different order of the transition, *for the same exponent of the same material*. For example, the reported values of the exponent β are scattered from 0.21 (Tb; X-ray) [13], 0.23 (Tb; neutron) [14], 0.25(Tb; neutron) [9], 0.3(Ho; neutron) [15], 0.335(Dy; Mösbauer) [8], 0.37(Ho; X-ray) [16], 0.38(Dy; neutron) [17], 0.39(Ho; neutron) [18] to 0.39(Dy; neutron) [18].

In 1985-6, first theoretical analysis of the critical properties of stacked-triangular antiferromagnets was made by the present author for both cases of XY and Heisenberg spins [19,20]. By means of a symmetry analysis and Monte Carlo simulations,

4

it was claimed that, due to its chiral degrees of freedom, phase transition of these stacked-triangular antiferromagnets might be novel, possibly belonging to a new universality, called the *chiral universality class*, different from the standard $O(n)$ Wilson-Fisher universality class. The critical singularity observed in Monte Carlo simulations was stronger than that of the unfrustrated collinear XY and Heisenberg magnets, opposite to the Bak and Mukamel's $O(4)$ prediction. Indeed, the exponent values determined by Monte Carlo simulations were $\alpha = 0.34 \pm 0.06$, $\beta = 0.253 \pm 0.01$, $\gamma = 1.13 \pm 0.05$ and $\nu = 0.54 \pm 0.02$ for the XY case, and $\alpha = 0.24 \pm 0.08$, $\beta = 0.30 \pm 0.02$, $\gamma = 1.17 \pm 0.07$ and $\nu = 0.59 \pm 0.02$ for the Heisenberg case [21]. It was predicted that such novel critical behavior should be observed in the stacked-triangular XY antiferromagnet $CsMnBr_3$ (n=2 chiral universality) [20,22], and in the stacked-triangular Heisenberg antiferromagnets VCl_2 and VBr_2 (n=3 chiral universality) [19,22], while helimagnets such as Ho, Dy and Tb were also argued to exhibit the same novel $n = 2$ chiral critical behavior asymptotically [20,22]. RG $\epsilon = 4 - d$ and $1/n$ expansion analyses were also made by the author, and a new fixed point describing the noncollinear criticality was identified [23].

Stimulated by this theoretical prediction, several experiments were subsequently made on the critical properties of stacked-triangular antiferromagnets $CsMnBr_3$, VCl_2 and VBr_2. The first experimental measurements of the critical properties of the stacked-triangular XY antiferromagnet $CsMnBr_3$ were performed by the two groups, *i.e.,* neutron-scattering measurements by the McMaster group (Mason, Gaulin and Collins) [24] and the one by the Japanese group (Ajiro, Kadowaki and coworkers) [25]. The results of these two independent measurements were consistent with each other and yielded the exponent values close to the predicted values, giving some support to the chiral-universality scenario. Since then, further measurements have been performed on $CsMnBr_3$, including high-precision specific-heat measurements by the Santa Cruz group (Wang, Belanger and Gaulin) [26] and the one by the Karlsruhe group (Deutschmann, Wosnitza, von Löhneysen and Kremer) [27]. For the stacked-triangular Heisenberg antiferromagnets VCl_2 and VBr_2, following the first specific-heat measurements by Takeda and coworkers [28], both neutron-scattering [29] and specific-heat [30] measurements were performed. Most of the obtained exponents and the specific-heat amplitude ratio were in reasonable agreement with the predicted values.

By contrast, a more conservative view was proposed by Azaria, Delamotte and Jolicoeur a few years later [31,32]. These authors studied a certain nonlinear sigma model expected to describe the Heisenberg ($n = 3$) noncollinear or canted magnets based on the RG $\epsilon = d - 2$ expansion technique, and found a stable fixed point which was nothing but the standard $O(4)$ Wilson-Fisher fixed point. These authors then suggested that the magnetic phase transition of noncollinear magnets, including both stacked-triangular antiferromagnets and helimagnets, might be of standard

$O(4)$ universality. The O(4) fixed point found there for the Heisenberg spins is different in nature from the $O(4)$-like fixed point found by Bak and Mukamel for the XY spins [4]: The former $O(4)$ fixed point has no counterpart in the $\epsilon = 4 - d$ expansion. Azaria *et al* further speculated that the noncollinear transition could be either first order or mean-field tricritical depending on the microscopic properties of the system.

One useful method to directly test those theoretical predictions is a Monte Carlo simulation on a simple spin model. Following the first Monte Carlo study on the XY and Heisenberg stacked-triangular antiferromagnets [19-21], extensive Monte Carlo simulations have been performed by several different groups, including Saclay group (Bhattacharya, Billore, Lacaze and Jolicoeur; Heisenberg) [33], Cergy group (Loison, Boubcheur and Diep; XY [34] and Heisenberg [35]), and by Sherbrooke group (Mailhot, Plumer and Caillé; XY [36] and Heisenberg [37]). In the numerical sense, the reported results agreed with each other and with the earlier simulation of Ref. 21, except for a small difference left in some exponents of the XY system. More specifically, in the Heisenberg case, the results support the chiral-universality scenario in the sense that a continuous transition characterized by the novel exponents were observed in common. In particular, one may now rule out the possibility of the standard $O(4)$ critical behavior and of the mean-field tricritical behavior predicted by Azaria *et al*. In the XY case, the results are again consistent with the chiral-universality scenario, but inconsistent with the $O(4)$-like behavior predicted by Bak and Mukamel. Meanwhile, since the exponent values predicted for the $n = 2$ chiral-universality are not much different from the mean-field tricritical values $\alpha = 0.5$, $\beta = 0.25$ and $\gamma = 1$, some authors interpreted their Monte Carlo results on the XY model in favor of the mean-field tricritical behavior rather than the chiral universality [36]. One should also bear in mind that the possibility of a weak first-order transition may not completely be ruled out from numerical simulations for finite lattices.

Important progress was also made in the study of the magnetic phase diagram and the multicritical behavior of stacked-triangular antiferromagnets under external magnetic fields. In particular, magnetic phase diagram with a novel multicritical point, different from those of the standard unfrustrated antiferromagnets, was observed by Johnson, Rayne and Friedberg for weakly Ising-like stacked-triangular antiferromagnet $CsNiCl_3$ by susceptibility measurements [38]. For the stacked-triangular XY antiferromagnet $CsMnBr_3$, Gaulin, Mason, Collins and Larese revealed by neutron-scattering measurements that the zero-field transition point corresponds to a tetracritical point in the magnetic field – temperature phase diagram [39]. These novel critical and multicritical properties of stacked-triangular antiferromagnets under external fields were theoretically investigated by Kawamura, Caillé and Plumer within a scaling theory based on the chiral-universality scenario,

and several prediction were made [40]. To test these scaling predictions, further experiments were performed in turn, which revealed features of the noncollinear transitions under external fields.

(d) Outline of the article

In the following sections, I wish to review in more detail these theoretical and experimental studies concerning the critical properties of noncollinear or canted magnets [41-44]. In §2, I will explain several typical magnetic materials exhibiting the noncollinear spin order, and introduce simple spin models used in describing these noncollinear transitions. The LGW Hamiltonian appropriate for the noncollinear transitions is also introduced. In §3, an intuitive symmetry argument is given on the basis of the notion of the order-parameter space. Symmetry properties of the LGW Hamiltonian is also examined. Analysis of topological defects in the noncollinearly-ordered state is given, and the nature of topological phase transitions mediated by the topological defects is briefly discussed. Section 4 is devoted to the RG analyses of the noncollinear transitions, including $\epsilon = 4 - d$ expansion, $1/n$ expansion and $\epsilon = d - 2$ expansion. After presenting the results of these RG calculations, several different theoretical proposals are explained and discussed. In §5, the results of Monte Carlo simulations on the critical properties of XY and Heisenberg stacked-triangular antiferromagnets and of several related models are presented. In §6, experimental results on the critical properties of both stacked-triangular antiferromagnets and helimagnets are reviewed. A possible experimental method to measure the chirality is mentioned. The phase transition of stacked-triangular antiferromagnets under external magnetic fields is reviewed in §7, with particular emphasis on its phase diagram and novel multicritical behavior. Finally, in §8, I summarize the present status of the study, and discuss future problems.

§2. Materials and Models

In this section, I introduce typical materials and model systems which have been used in the study of noncollinear phase transitions. These include both (a) stacked-triangular antiferromagnets and (b) helimagnets.

(a) Stacked-triangular antiferromagnets

In stacked-triangular antiferromagnets, magnetic ions are located at each site of a three-dimensional stacked-triangular (simple hexagonal) lattice. Magnetic ions interact antiferromagnetically in the triangular layer, which causes the geometry-induced frustration. Most extensively studied stacked-triangular antiferromagnets are ABX_3-type compounds, A being elements such as Cs and Rb, B being magnetic

ions such as Mn, Cu, Ni, Co, and C being halogens such as Cl, Br and I [42,44]. While these materials are magnetically quasi-one-dimensional, it has been established that most of them exhibit a magnetic transition into a three-dimensionally ordered state at low temperatures with sharp magnetic Bragg peaks. There is a rich variety of materials depending on the combination of the constituent ions, A, B and C [44].

Crucial to the nature of phase transition is the type of magnetic anisotropy. Some of these compounds are Ising-like with easy-axis-type (or axial) anisotropy, some are XY-like with easy-plane-type (or planar) anisotropy, and others are Heisenberg-like with negligibly small anisotropy. In zero field, the noncollinear criticality is realized in the XY and Heisenberg systems, which include $CsMnBr_3$, $CsVBr_3$ (XY), $CsVCl_3$ and $RbNiCl_3$ (nearly Heisenberg) etc. By contrast, the Ising-like axial magnets including $CsNiCl_3$, $CsNiBr_3$, and $CsMnI_3$ often exhibit two successive phase transitions in zero field with the collinearly-ordered intermediate phase. If an external field of appropriate intensity is applied along an easy-axis, however, a direct transition from the paramagnetic state to the noncollinearly-ordered state becomes possible. Such transition in an external field is characterized by the nontrivial chirality, and will also be discussed later in §6 and §7.

Quasi-two-dimensional realization of stacked-triangular antiferromagnets may be vanadium compounds VX_2 with X=Cl and Br. VX_2 are nearly isotropic (Heisenberg-like) magnets with weak Ising-like anisotropy. While VX_2 exhibits two successive transitions at two distinct but mutually close temperatures due to the weak easy-axis-type anisotropy ($T_{N1} \simeq 35.88K$ and $T_{N2} \simeq 35.80K$ in case of VCl_2 [29]), it is expected to behave as an isotropic Heisenberg system except close to T_{N1} or T_{N2}.

Since our interest is on the noncollinear criticality, we will mainly be concerned in this article with vector spin systems, including both $n = 2$-component XY and $n = 3$-component Heisenberg spin models. A simple vector-spin Hamiltonian often used in modeling such stacked-triangular antiferromagnets may be given by

$$\mathcal{H} = -J \sum_{<ij>} \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j - J' \sum_{<<ij>>} \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j, \tag{2.1}$$

where $\vec{S}_i = (S_i^{(1)}, S_i^{(2)}, \cdots, S_i^{(n)})$ is an n-component unit vector with $\mid \vec{S}_i \mid = 1$ located at the i-th site of a stacked-triangular lattice, while $J < 0$ and J' represent the intraplane and interplane nearest-neighbor couplings. The first sum is taken over all nearest-neighbor pairs in the triangular layer, while the second sum is taken over all nearest-neighbor pairs along the chain direction orthogonal to the triangular layer.

(b) helimagnets

8

The second class of noncollinear magnets is a helimagnet or spiral magnet. Examples are β-MnO_2 and rare-earth metals Ho, Dy and Tb. Rare-earth helimagnets Ho, Dy and Tb crystallize into the hexagonal-closed-packed (hcp) structure, and form magnetic spiral along the c-axis below T_N with the moments lying in the basal plane. The interaction between magnetic moments is the long-range Ruderman-Kittel-Kasuya-Yoshida (RKKY) interaction which falls off as $1/r^3$ and oscillates in sign with distance r. The oscillating nature of the RKKY interaction leads to the frustration between the near-neighbor and further-neighbor interactions which stabilizes the noncollinear helical spin structure.

A simple model Hamiltonian which gives rise to a spiral structure is the axial-next-nearest-neighbor XY or Heisenberg model on a simple cubic lattice, with the ferromagnetic (or antiferromagnetic) nearest-neighbor interaction in all directions and the antiferromagnetic next-nearest-neighbor interaction along one particular direction, say x direction. The Hamiltonian may be written as

$$\mathcal{H} = -J_1 \sum_{<ij>} \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j - J_2 \sum_{<<ij>>} \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j, \tag{2.2}$$

where the first sum is taken over all nearest-neighbor pairs on the lattice while the second sum is taken over next-nearest-neighbor pairs along the x-direction. The competition between the nearest-neighbor interaction J_1 and the antiferromagnetic axial next-nearest-neighbor interactions $J_2 < 0$ gives rise to a magnetic spiral along the x direction when the value of $\mid J_2/J_1 \mid$ exceeds a certain critical value.

One difference of such spiral structure from the noncollinear structure in the stacked-triangular antiferromagnet is that the pitch of the helix is generally incommensurate with the underlying lattice, in contrast to the 120° spin structure which is always commensurate with the underlying lattice. (In fact, one can generate the incommensurate spin structure even in stacked-triangular antiferromagnets, e.g., by breaking the equivalence of the intraplane couplings [45,46]. This case might have some relevance to the incommensurate spin order in RbMnBr$_3$ as will be discussed in §6.)

(c) Landau-Ginzburg-Wilson (LGW) Hamiltonian

The spin Hamiltonians (2.1) and (2.2) have been written in terms of the spin variables of fixed length, $\mid \vec{S}_i \mid = 1$. In some of the RG analyses such as $\epsilon = 4 - d$ or $1/n$ expansions, an alternative form of Hamiltonian written in terms of spin-variables of unconstrained length is often used. It is given in the form of an expansion in order-parameter fields (critical modes), and is called the Landau-Ginzburg-Wilson (LGW) Hamiltonian. In the case of standard ferromagnets or unfrustrated collinear antiferromagnets, an appropriate LGW Hamiltonian is the

so-called $\vec{\phi}^4$ model whose Hamiltonian density is given by

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{LGW}} = \frac{1}{2}[(\bigtriangledown\vec{\phi})^2 + r\vec{\phi}^2 + u\vec{\phi}^4], \tag{2.3}$$

where n-component vector field $\vec{\phi} = (\phi_1, \phi_2, \cdots, \phi_n)$ represents near-critical mode around an instability point. In unfrustrated ferromagnets or antiferromagnets, the instability occurs only at one point in the wavevector space, as shown in Figs.5a and b. Therefore, single n-vector field $\vec{\phi}$ is enough to describe the phase transition.

By contrast, in the case of noncollinear or canted magnets such as stacked-triangualr antiferromagnets or helimagnets, the instability occurs simultaneously at two distinct points in the wavevector space. Therefore, two equivalent but distinct n-component vector fields are necessary to describe the associated phase transition. The situation is illustrated in Figs. 5c and 5d for the cases of stacked-triangular antiferromagnets and helimagnets, respectively. These two instability modes may be taken as the Fourier modes at $\pm\vec{Q}$, where $\vec{Q} = (4\pi/3, 0, 0, \cdots, 0)$ for the case of stacked-triangualr antiferromagnets, and $\vec{Q} = (2\pi/\lambda, 0, 0, \cdots, 0)$ for the case of helimagnets, λ being the pitch of the helix. It is convenient for later use to extend the model to general d spatial dimensions. In the case of stacked-triangular antiferromagnets, the lattice is then regarded as two-dimensional triangular layers stacked in hypercubic fashion along the remaining $d-2$ directions, while in the case of helimagnets, the competing second-neighbor interaction is assumed to work only along the first direction in d dimensions, along which the helix is formed.

One can derive the soft-spin LGW Hamiltonian starting from the microscopic hard-spin Hamiltonian (2.1) or (2.2) by a series of transformations [23]. By softening the fixed-length spin condition, Fourier transforming, and retaining only near critical models, one obtains

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{LGW}} = \frac{1}{2}[(\bigtriangledown\vec{a})^2 + (\bigtriangledown\vec{b})^2 + r(\vec{a}^2 + \vec{b}^2) + u(\vec{a}^2 + \vec{b}^2)^2 + v\{(\vec{a}\cdot\vec{b})^2 - \vec{a}^2\vec{b}^2\}], \quad (2.4)$$

where $\vec{a}$ and $\vec{b}$ are n-component vector fields representing the cosine and sine components associated with the noncollinear spin structure at wavevectors $\pm\vec{Q}$ via,

$$\vec{S}(\vec{r}) = \vec{a}(\vec{r})\cos(\vec{Q}\cdot\vec{r}) + \vec{b}(\vec{r})\sin(\vec{Q}\cdot\vec{r}). \tag{2.5}$$

In order that the spin structure (2.5) really represents the noncollinear order, the $\vec{a}$ and $\vec{b}$ fields must be orthogonal with each other. This requires that the quartic coupling v in the LGW Hamiltonian (2.4) should be positive. If v is negative, on the other hand, the spin structure given by (2.5) represents the collinearly-ordered SDW state (or the sinusoidal state). The LGW Hamiltonian (2.4) forms a basis of the following RG $\epsilon = 4 - d$ and $1/n$ expansion analysis.

In the particular case of XY ($n = 2$) spins, one can transform (2.4) into a different form [23],

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{LGW}} = \frac{1}{2}[(\nabla \vec{A})^2 + (\nabla \vec{B})^2 + r(\vec{A}^2 + \vec{B}^2) + (u - \frac{1}{4}v)(\vec{A}^4 + \vec{B}^4) + 2(u + \frac{1}{4}v)\vec{A}^2 \vec{B}^2], \quad (2.6)$$

where $\vec{A}$ and $\vec{B}$ are two-component fields defined by

$$A_x = (a_x + b_y)/\sqrt{2}, \quad B_x = (a_y + b_x)/\sqrt{2},$$

$$A_y = (a_y - b_x)/\sqrt{2}, \quad B_y = (-a_x + b_y)/\sqrt{2}. \quad (2.7)$$

The RG analysis of Ref. 4 was performed on the basis of the form (2.6), rather than (2.4). From (2.6), it is easy to see that, in the case of $n = 2$, the model reduces to two decoupled XY models on the special manifold $v = -4u$. Note that this manifold lies in the sinusoidal region, $v < 0$.

Essentially the same LGW Hamiltonian has also been used in other problems such as the phase transition of the dipole-locked A phase of helium three [47,48], the superconducting phase transition of the heavy fermion superconductor UPt$_3$ [49], and the quantum phase transition of certain Josephson junction array in a magnetic field [50].

§3. Symmetry

(a) Symmetry of the ordered state

Because of its nontrivial chiral degrees of freedom, symmetry of the ordered state of frustrated noncollinear magnets differs from that of unfrustrated collinear magnets. Let us consider, for example, the case of the $n=3$-component Heisenberg spins. In the unfrustrated collinear case, spins align parallel or antiparallel with each other forming the collinear ground state. One can see that such a ground state is invariant under the global spin rotation around the magnetization (or the sublattice magnetization) axis. In the frustrated noncollinear case, by contrast, the 120° spin structure does not have such an invariance. Therefore, symmetries of the ordered states are clearly different in the collinear and the noncollinear cases. Obviously, the conventional index n, the number of the spin components, is inadequate to distinguish between such differences in the symmetry of the ordered states.

In order to characterize the relevant symmetry, it is convenient to introduce the notion of order-parameter space, which is a topological space isomorphic to the set of ordered states [51]. In the collinear case, the order-parameter space V may be represented by a single arrow in the three-dimensional spin space and is isomorphic to the two-dimensional sphere S_2 (the surface of a ball in Euclidean three-space). In

11

the noncollinear case, the order-parameter space cannot be represented by a single arrow. Instead, additional structure caused by noncollinear alignment of spins leads to an order-parameter space isomorphic to the three-dimensional rotation group $SO(3)$, or equivalently, to the projective space P_3 [3]. In the collinear case, rotation invariance around the magnetization axis reduces the order-parameter space to $V = SO(3)/SO(2) = S_2$.

In the case of the n=2-component XY spins, the order-parameter space of unfrustrated collinear systems is $V = S_1 = SO(2)$, while that of frustrated non-collinear systems is $V = Z_2 \times S_1 = Z_2 \times SO(2) = O(2)$ where Z_2 pertains to the aforementioned twofold chiral degeneracy while $S_1 = SO(2)$ pertains the rotation symmetry of the original XY spins.

Order-parameter space may also be defined as a topological space obtained by dividing the whole symmetry group of the Hamiltonian, which we assume to be $O(n)$, by the subgroup which keeps the ordered state (symmetry-broken state) unchanged [51]. With use of this definition, one can easily generalize the argument to the general $n \geq 2$-component vector spins. In the unfrustrated collinear case, the invariant subgroup turns out to be $O(n-1)$, consisting of the rotation around the magnetization axis. This leads to the associated order-parameter space isomorphic to the $(n-1)$-dimensional hypersphere, $V = O(n)/O(n-1) = SO(n)/SO(n-1) = S_{n-1}$. In the particular cases of n=2 or 3, this simply reproduces the results mentioned above.

In the frustrated noncollinear case, if one notes that the 120° spin structure spans the two-dimensional subspace in n-dimensional spin space, one may see that the invariant subgroup is $O(n-2)$ rather than $O(n-1)$. Thus, the order-parameter space for the $n \geq 2$-component noncollinear systems is isomorphic to the Stiefel manifold, $V = O(n)/O(n-2)$ [41]. In the n=2 case, it reduces to $V = O(2)$ since $O(0) = 1$, whereas in the $n = 3$ case, it reduces to $V = SO(3)$ since $O(1) = Z_2$.

Thus, the difference in the symmetry of the ordered states can be described in topological terms as the difference in the associated order-parameter spaces. Since the symmetry of the ordered state is a crucial ingredient of the corresponding disordering phase transition, this observation strongly suggests that the frustrated noncollinear magnets might exhibit a novel phase transition, possibly belonging to a new universality class [19,20]. Of course, another possibility might be that these noncollinear magnets exhibit a first-order transition. One cannot even rule out the possibility that the symmetry is dynamically restored at the transition, and the noncollinear transition is of conventional Wilson-Fisher universality class. In order to determine which of the above possibilities is actually the case, more detailed analysis is needed. Still, the fact that one obtains for frustrated noncollinear magnets the order-parameter space different from that for the unfrustrated collinear magnets gives a hint that something new may happen in the noncollinear transitions.

(b) Symmetry of the LGW Hamiltonian

Next, let us examine the symmetry property of the LGW Hamiltonian of non-collinear magnets with n-component spins, eq.(2.4). The LGW Hamiltonian is invariant under the following two symmetry transformations; that is (i) $O(n)$ spin rotation, $\vec{a}' = R\vec{a}$, $\vec{b}' = R\vec{b}$ with $R \in O(n)$, as well as (ii) $O(2)$ phase rotation, $\vec{a}' = \cos\theta\vec{a} - \sin\theta\vec{b}$, $\vec{b}' = \pm(\sin\theta\vec{a} + \cos\theta\vec{b})$ [23]. The latter invariance arises from the arbitrariness in choosing the phase and the handedness of the two basis vectors.

Conversely, the symmetry requirements (i) and (ii) fully determine the form of the Hamiltonian up to quartic order in the fields $\vec{a}$ and $\vec{b}$ as given in (2.4). One may easily see that this $O(n) \times O(2)$ symmetry of the LGW Hamiltonian just corresponds to the aforementioned order-parameter space $V = O(n)/O(n-2)$.

In the case of $n = 2$, and in this case only, the LGW Hamiltonian (2.4) has a discrete symmetry independent of the above $O(n) \times O(2)$ symmetry. This corresponds to the permutation of the field variables, (iii) $(a'_x = a_x,\ a'_y = b_x,\ b'_x = a_y,\ b'_y = b_y)$ or $(a'_x = b_y,\ a'_y = a_y,\ b'_x = b_x,\ b'_y = a_x)$.

(c) Classification of topological defects

One property which can be determined solely from the topological considerations is the classification of topological defects in the ordered state. Although we leave the details of the method to Ref.51, the point is that one can obtain all possible topological defects together with their 'topological quantum number' from the knowledge of its order-parameter space V by examining its r-th homotopy group, $\Pi_r(V)$.

Topological defects play an essential role in the phase transition of two-dimensional systems. Many two-dimensional phase transitions, such as the Kosterlitz-Thouless transition, are known to be 'defect mediated' [52]. Classification of topological defects in the collinear and noncollinear $d = 2$-dimensional magnets is given in Table I for both cases of XY ($n = 2$) and Heisenberg ($n = 3$) spins [3].

The noncollinear 2D XY systems, such as the triangular-lattice XY antiferromagnets and the Josephson-junction arrays in a magnetic field, possess the standard Kosterlitz-Thouless-type vortex characterized by the integral topological quantum number Z as well as the chiral domain wall characterized by the two-valued topological quantum number Z_2. The vortex (point defect) concerns the continuous XY degrees of freedom via the relation $(\Pi_1(S_1) = Z)$, while the domain wall (line defect) concerns the discrete chiral degrees of freedom via the relation $(\Pi_0(Z_2) = Z_2)$. Since earlier MC works on the triangular XY antiferromagnet by Miyashita and Shiba [2] and by Lee *et al* [53], and the one on the Josephson-junction array by Teitel and Jayaprakash [54], many numerical works have been made with interest in how these two degrees of freedom order. While the existence of a phase transition

13

with a sharp specific-heat anomaly driven by the appearance of the chiral long-range order has been established, the question whether the spin and the chirality order at the same temperature, or at two close but distinct temperatures, still remains somewhat controversial [55,56].

As was first observed by Kawamura and Miyashita [3], the noncollinear Heisenberg magnets, such as the triangular Heisenberg antiferromagnet, possess a peculiar vortex characterized by its quantum number Z_2 (Z_2-vortex), different in nature from the standard Z-vortex of the XY magnets. Although it is generally believed that the two-dimensional Heisenberg model does not exhibit any phase transition at finite temperature [57], possible existence of a novel topological phase transition mediated by these Z_2 vortices was suggested by Kawamura and Miyashita in the two-dimensional triangular Heisenberg antiferromagnet [3]. The predicted low-temperature phase is an exotic spin-liquid phase where the two-point spin correlation decays exponentially and the spin correlation length remains finite. A quantity called vorticity modulus, characterizing such exotic vortex order not accompanying the conventional spin order, was proposed and calculated [58,59].

In three spatial dimensions, our main concern here, point defects in two dimensions appear as line defects. Hence, the noncollinear XY magnets in $d = 3$ dimensions possess Z-vortex lines in addition to the Z_2 chiral domain walls, while the noncollinear Heisenberg magnets possess Z_2-vortex lines. Although it is possible and enlightening to understand the nature of the three-dimensional transitions also as defected-mediated [60], we follow more standard theoretical approaches in this article in which these topological defects do not show up in an explicit way.

§4. Theoretical analysis of critical properties I — renormalization-group analysis

In this section, I will review the theoretical analysis of the critical properties of noncollinear transitions based on several renormalization-group (RG) methods in some detail, including $\epsilon = 4 - d$ expansion, $1/n$ expansion and $\epsilon = d - 2$ expansion.

(a) Mean-field approximation

Standard RG calculations such as $\epsilon = 4 - d$ and $1/n$ expansions are generally performed based on the soft-spin LGW Hamiltonian. Before entering into the RG analysis, it may be instructive here to summarize the results of the standard mean-field approximation applied to the LGW Hamiltonian, eq.(2.4) [23].

When the quartic coupling constant v is positive and satisfies the inequality $v < 4u$, a continuous transition takes place at $r = 0$ between the paramagnetic and the noncollinear states characterized by

$$| \vec{a} |^2 = | \vec{b} |^2 = -r/(4u - v), \quad \vec{a} \perp \vec{b} \qquad (0 < v < 4u), \qquad (4.1a)$$

When v is negative, by contrast, there is a continuous transition at $r = 0$ between the paramagnetic and the collinearly-ordered sinusoidal states characterized by

$$| \vec{a} |^2 + | \vec{b} |^2 = -r/2u, \qquad \vec{a} \parallel \vec{b} \quad (v < 0). \tag{4.1b}$$

Note that, in the sinusoidal case, the relative magnitude of $\vec{a}$ and $\vec{b}$ is not determined: This corresponds physically to the sliding degree of freedom of the spin-density wave.

Stability of the free energy requires the condition

$$u > 0, \quad v < 4u. \tag{4.2}$$

When $u < 0$ or $v > 4u$, higher-order (sixth-order) term is necessary to stabilize the free energy, and the transition in such a case generally becomes *first order*. The mean-field phase diagram in the u-v plane is summarized in Fig.6. Continuous transitions are characterized by the standard mean-field exponents, $\alpha = 0$, $\beta = 1/2$ and $\gamma = 1$ *etc.*, while the mean-field tricritical exponents $\alpha = 1/2$, $\beta = 1/4$ and $\gamma = 1$ *etc.* are realized along the stability boundary $v = 4u$. Of course, fluctuations generally change these conclusions as we shall see below.

(b) $\epsilon = 4 - d$ expansion

In this subsection, I will review the RG $\epsilon = 4 - d$ expansion results for the noncollinear transition. Earlier attempts were made for XY ($n = 2$) helimagnets to $O(\epsilon^2)$ by Bak and Mukamel [4], and later by Barak and Walker [10], with interest in the paramagnetic-helimagnetic transition of rare-earth metals Ho, Dy Tb. Similar $O(\epsilon^2)$ analysis for general n-component helimagnets was made by Garel and Pheuty with interest in the possible commensurability effect on the helical transition [5], and by Jones, Love and Moore [47] and by Bailin, Love and Moore [48] in the context of the superfluidity transition of helium three. Fuller analysis in light of possible new universality class was made by the present author [23]. More recently, higher-order calculation to $O(\epsilon^3)$ was made by Antonenko, Sokolov and Varnashev [61]. Since the obtained results were sometimes interpreted in different ways by these authors, I will postpone the discussion of their physical implications to later subsections and will first present the results based on Refs. [23] and [61].

RG flow diagram, fixed points and critical exponents

Let us consider the LGW Hamiltonian for general n-component noncollinear magnets, eq (2.4). Its upper critical dimension is $d_> = 4$ and a standard RG $\epsilon = 4 - d$ expansion can be performed. Near four dimensions, there are up to *four* fixed points depending on the value of n. Two exist for all n: One is the trivial Gaussian field point located at the origin ($u^* = v^* = 0$), which is always unstable against both u and v perturbations; the other corresponds to the conventional isotropic $O(2n)$

15

Heisenberg fixed point at $(u^* > 0, v^* = 0)$, which is stable for sufficiently small n. To describe the remaining fixed points, we consider four distinct regimes of relating n and d.

I. $n > n_{\mathrm{I}}(d) = 12 + 4\sqrt{6} - [(36 + 14\sqrt{6})/3]\epsilon + [\frac{137}{150} + \frac{91}{300}\sqrt{6} + (\frac{13}{5} + \frac{47}{60}\sqrt{6})\zeta(3)]\epsilon^2 + O(\epsilon^3) \simeq 21.8 - 23.4\epsilon + 7.1\epsilon^2 + O(\epsilon^3)$

When n is sufficiently large to meet this condition, two new fixed points appear in the noncollinear region $v > 0$. They may be termed *chiral*, C_+, and *antichiral*, C_-, the former being stable in accord with the RG flow sketched in Fig.7a. When n approaches $n_{\mathrm{I}}(d)$, the chiral and antichiral fixed points coalesce at a point in the upper half (u, v) plane and become complex-valued for $n < n_{\mathrm{I}}(d)$. In the sinusoidal region, $v < 0$, no stable fixed points are found.

II. $n_{\mathrm{I}}(d) > n > n_{\mathrm{II}}(d) = 12 - 4\sqrt{6} - [(36 - 14\sqrt{6})/3]\epsilon + [\frac{137}{150} - \frac{91}{300}\sqrt{6} + (\frac{13}{5} - \frac{47}{60}\sqrt{6})\zeta(3)]\epsilon^2 + O(\epsilon^3) \simeq 2.20 - 0.57\epsilon + 0.99\epsilon^2 + O(\epsilon^3)$

The RG flows are now as depicted in Fig.7b. Only the Gaussian and Heisenberg fixed points are present and both are unstable. Consequently, the transition to both noncollinear and sinusoidal phases is expected to be first order.

III. $n_{\mathrm{II}}(d) > n > n_{\mathrm{III}}(d) = 2 - \epsilon + \frac{5}{24}(6\zeta(3) - 1)\epsilon^2 + O(\epsilon^3) \simeq 2 - \epsilon + 1.3\epsilon^2 + O(\epsilon^3)$

In this regime, a new pair of fixed points appear in the sinusoidal region, $v < 0$, which may be termed *sinusoidal*, S_+, and *antisinusoidal*, S_-. The corresponding flows resemble those sketched in Fig.7c. The fixed point S_+ is the fixed point identified by Bak and Mukamel [4], and by Garel and Pheuty [5], as a physical fixed point governing the XY $(n = 2)$ helimagnets in $d = 3$. In the case of $n = 2$, S_+ coincides to $O(\epsilon)$ with the $O(4)$ fixed point, H, on the $v = 0$ axis, while it moves to the lower-half plane at higher order in ϵ. Thus, S_+ is the $O(4)$-like fixed point to $O(\epsilon^2)$ in the sense that all exponents agree with the isotropic $O(4)$ exponents, but it is not exactly an $O(4)$ fixed point as can be confirmed by the higher-order calculation [62]. In any case, this Bak and Mukamel fixed point is located in the sinusoidal region $v < 0$, and cannot be invoked to describe the noncollinear phase transitions [10]. As $n \to n_{\mathrm{III}}(d)$, the sinusoidal fixed point S_+ approaches the $v = 0$ axis and, at $n = n_{\mathrm{III}}(d)$, it meets the Heisenberg fixed point H and exchanges stability with it. In the noncollinear region $v > 0$, no stable fixed point exists.

IV. $n > n_{\mathrm{III}}(d)$

As illustrated in Fig.7d, the unstable fixed point S_+ now lies above the $v = 0$ axis. The Heisenberg fixed point H is stable and governs the critical behavior of regions of both noncollinear and sinusoidal ordered behavior.

In view of the above four cases, one can see that, in the noncollinear region $v > 0$, the stable fixed point describing the noncollinear transition is either the

16

chiral fixed point C_+, which is stable for sufficiently large n

$$n > n_{\mathrm{I}}(d) = 21.8 - 23.4\epsilon + 7.1\epsilon^2 + O(\epsilon^3), \tag{4.3}$$

or the $O(2n)$ Heisenberg fixed point H, stable for sufficiently small $n < n_{\mathrm{III}}(d)$. At these stable fixed points, critical exponents can be calculated in the standard manner. The exponents at the standard Heisenberg fixed point are well-known, while the ones at the chiral fixed point are new. To the lowest-order, the exponents γ and ν at the chiral fixed point were calculated as [23]

$$\gamma \approx 2\nu = 1 + \frac{n(n^2 + n + 48) + (n+4)(n-3)\sqrt{n^2 - 24n + 48}}{4(n^3 + 4n^2 - 24n + 144)}\epsilon + O(\epsilon^2). \tag{4.4}$$

These γ and ν are numerically smaller than the corresponding $O(n)$ Heisenberg values. The critical-point decay exponent to $O(\epsilon^2)$ was calculated as [23]

$$\eta = \frac{n(n^2 + n + 48) + (n+4)(n-3)\sqrt{n^2 - 24n + 48}}{4(n^3 + 4n^2 - 24n + 144)}\epsilon^2 + O(\epsilon^3). \tag{4.5}$$

In the noncollinear region $v > 0$, the facts concerning the stable fixed points are summarized in Fig.8.

Crucial question is what happens at the physically significant points, $\epsilon = 1$ ($d = 3$) with $n = 2$ and 3. Unfortunately, these are rather far from the $\epsilon \to 0$ limit, and thus, it is very difficult to obtain truly definitive answer from the ϵ expansion with only a few terms. In fact, different authors gave different conjectures. The existence of the chiral fixed point C_+ was first noticed for large enough n ($n > 21.8$) by Moore and coworkers in Refs. 46 and 47 in the context of helium three, while these authors claimed that the transition in the physical case ($n = 3$, $d = 3$) was first order since $n = 3$ was significantly smaller than 21.8. Detailed study of the chiral fixed point, including the ϵ-expansion expression of the stability boundary $n_{\mathrm{I}}(d)$, was first given in Ref.23, where it was argued in view of the Monte Carlo results that the chiral fixed point might remain stable down to $n = 2$ or 3 in $d = 3$. In contrast, Antonenko, Sokolov and Varnashev claimed based on their $O(\epsilon^2)$ expression of $n_{\mathrm{I}}(d)$ and its Borel-Padé resummation that the transition in $d = 3$ was first order for both $n = 2$ and 3 [61].

Instead of the $\epsilon = 4 - d$ expansion where the dimension d is expanded in powers of ϵ, one can also perform the RG loop expansion directly at $d = 3$. This was also done by Antonenko and Sokolov to three-loop order, yielding the results similar to the ϵ-expansion calculation to the same order [63].

Note also that, if one makes the standard ϵ expansion with fixing n at $n = 2$ or 3 (or any value smaller than 21.8), the chiral fixed point can never be seen [4].

17

This is simply because the ϵ-expansion method can detect only the type of fixed point which exists, stable or unstable, in the $\epsilon \to 0$ limit.

In the special case of XY ($n = 2$) sinusoidal ordering $v < 0$, one can give a nonperturbative argument to identify the stable fixed point in $d = 3$, making use of the fact that the system reduces to the decoupled XY models on the line $v = -4u$. In the XY case, the fixed point S_- is located on this $v = -4u$ line and becomes the standard XY fixed point ($O(2)$ Wilson-Fisher fixed point). One can then show based on nonperturbative argument that this XY fixed point is stable in $d = 3$ [64]. This is in contrast to the behavior obtained from the low-order ϵ expansion as sketched in Fig.7c, where the fixed point S_- is unstable [61,62,65]. Unfortunately, this discrepancy between the low-order ϵ-expansion result and the nonperturbative result cannot be remedied even if one goes to higher order, say to $O(\epsilon^3)$, and makes a resummation procedure [62]. This observation gives us a warning that one should not overtrust the answer from the $\epsilon = 4 - d$ expansion in some subtle cases, even when relatively higher-order calculation, say to $O(\epsilon^3)$, was made together with the resummation technique.

Chirality and other composite operators

In this subsection, we show how the chirality, defined in §1(b) as a quantity characterizing the noncollinear spin structure, manifests itself in the RG $\epsilon = 4 - d$ expansion. As shown in §1(b), the chirality is a pseudoscalar in the XY case and an axial vector in the Heisenberg case. In accord with the LGW Hamiltonian (2.4), one can also generalize the definition of the chirality for general n-component spins as a second-rank antisymmetric tensor variable defined by $\kappa_{\lambda,\nu} = a_\lambda b_\mu - a_\mu b_\lambda$ ($1 \leq \lambda, \mu \leq n$), which has $n(n-1)/2$ independent components [23].

One may define a conjugate chiral field, h_κ, which couples to a component of the chirality via a term $-h_\kappa \kappa_{\lambda,\nu}$ in the LGW Hamiltonian. Application of the chiral field h_κ reduces the original symmetry of the Hamiltonian. The noncollinear structure is then confined to the (λ, μ) plane and one out of two senses of the helix is selected. It is thus expected that the application of h_κ causes a crossover from the fully chiral behavior to the standard XY behavior.

If there is a stable fixed for $h_\kappa = 0$, say, a chiral fixed point, this crossover is governed by the chiral crossover exponent ϕ_κ associated with that fixed point. The singular part of the free energy then has a scaling form [23],

$$f_{sing} \approx F(\frac{h}{t^\Delta}, \frac{h_\kappa}{t^{\phi_\kappa}}), \tag{4.6}$$

where h is an ordering field conjugate to the order parameter $\vec{a}$ or $\vec{b}$, $\Delta \equiv \beta + \gamma$ is the gap exponent (the crossover exponent associated with the ordering field), and $t \equiv |(T - T_c)/T_c|$. If the total chirality, $\bar{\kappa} = -(\partial f / \partial h_\kappa)_{h_\kappa=0}$, and the chiral

susceptibility, $\chi_\kappa = -(\partial^2 f/\partial h_\kappa^2)_{h_\kappa=0}$, are characterized by critical exponents β_κ and γ_κ, the above scaling gives $\beta_\kappa = 2 - \alpha - \phi_\kappa$ and $\gamma_\kappa = 2\phi_\kappa - (2 - \alpha)$, and the chirality exponents satisfy the relation,

$$\alpha + 2\beta_\kappa + \gamma_\kappa = 2, \tag{4.7}$$

together with the standard relation $\alpha + 2\beta + \gamma = 2$.

In particular, in the region $n > n_{\mathrm{I}}(d)$ where the chiral fixed point is stable, the chiral crossover exponent ϕ_κ has been calculated by the $\epsilon = 4 - d$ expansion as [23]

$$\phi_\kappa = 1 + \frac{n^3 + 4n^2 + 56n - 96 + (n^2 - 24)\sqrt{n^2 - 24n + 48}}{4(n^3 + 4n^2 - 24n + 144)}\epsilon + O(\epsilon^2). \tag{4.8}$$

Chirality defined here is a quantity *quadratic* in spin variables. At the standard $O(n)$ Wilson-Fisher fixed point, there is only *one* crossover exponent at quartic order in the spins, namely, the standard anisotropy-crossover exponent. At the $O(n)$ chiral fixed point, as a reflection of richer underlying symmetry, there generally exist *four* different crossover exponents even at the quadratic level, which physically represent *chirality, wavevector-dependent anisotropy, uniform anisotropy and wavevector-dependent energy* perturbations [23]. Among them, the chiral-crossover exponent ϕ_κ is the largest. In the particular case of XY ($n = 2$) spins, the discrete symmetry of the LGW Hamiltonian discussed in §3(b) (the symmetry iii) mixes the two otherwise independent composite operators, uniform anisotropy and wavevector-dependent energy, and reduces this number from four to *three* [66].

Effects of commensurability

Under certain circumstances, the LGW Hamiltonian (2.4) could have terms with a lower symmetry. An example may be seen in the 90° spiral in helimagnets, where the turn angle is just equal to 90°. In such a case, as first noticed by Garel and Pheuty [5], the LGW Hamiltonian has an additional quartic term of the form,

$$w(\vec{a}^4 + \vec{b}^4). \tag{4.9}$$

Garel and Pheuty studied the relevance of this quartic term by $\epsilon = 4 - d$ expansion, and concluded that this term was relevant in the physical case ($d = 3$, $n = 2$) and changed the nature of the helical transition from continuous to first order [5]. In contrast, the present author argued that this term was irrelevant in the ($d = 3$, $n = 2$) helical transition and even the 90° spiral exhibited a continuous transition of $n = 2$ chiral universality [45]. The difference comes from the fact that the fixed points identified by those authors were in fact different: The fixed point invoked by Garel and Pheuty was the Bak and Mukamel fixed point [4] while the one invoked by the present author was the chiral fixed point [23].

(b) $1/n$ expansion

In the many-component limit $n \to \infty$, the LGW Hamiltonian (2.4) can be solved exactly for arbitrary dimensionality d. In the noncollinear case $v > 0$, on which we shall concentrate in this subsection, one has a continuous transition characterized by the standard spherical-model exponents, $\alpha = (d-4)/(d-2)$, $\beta = 1/2$, $\gamma = 2\nu = 2/(d-2)$ for $2 < d < 4$ [23]. (In the sinusoidal case $v < 0$, the $n \to \infty$ behavior is more complex: See Ref.67 for details.) Thus, in the noncollinear case, one can make the standard $1/n$ expansion from the spherical model based on the LGW Hamiltonian (2.4). In the $1/n$ expansion, the transition is always continuous for $2 < d < 4$: First-order transition found in the $\epsilon = 4 - d$ expansion for $n < n_I(d)$ does not arise. Various exponents to leading order in $1/n$ were calculated as [23]

$$\gamma = \frac{2}{d-2}\{1 - 9\frac{S_d}{n}\} + O(\frac{1}{n^2}), \tag{4.10}$$

$$\nu = \frac{1}{d-2}\{1 - 12\frac{d-1}{d}\frac{S_d}{n}\} + O(\frac{1}{n^2}), \tag{4.11}$$

etc., where S_d is defined by

$$S_d = \sin\{\pi(d-2)/2\}\Gamma(d-1)/[2\pi\{\Gamma(d/2)\}^2]. \tag{4.12}$$

For $n \to \infty$ and $\epsilon \to 0$, these $1/n$-expansion results match the ϵ-expansion results *obtained at the chiral fixed point*. On comparison with the results for the standard $O(n)$ Heisenberg exponents, one sees that both γ and ν of the noncollinear transition are smaller than those of the collinear transition, a tendency consistent with the $\epsilon = 4 - d$ expansion results.

The chiral crossover exponent ϕ_κ was calculated as [23]

$$\phi_\kappa = \frac{1}{d-2}\{1 - 12\frac{d-1}{d}\frac{S_d}{n}\} + O(\frac{1}{n^2}). \tag{4.13}$$

Comparison with the expression for γ shows that the chiral crossover exponent exceeds the susceptibility exponent γ, although it is smaller than the gap exponent Δ. Note that the same inequality is also satisfied within the $\epsilon = 4 - d$ expansion at the chiral fixed point. This inequality is somewhat unusual since in usual cases crossover exponents have satisfied the inequality $\phi \le \gamma$. The complete spectrum of crossover exponents at the quadratic level of spins was given in Ref.23.

A modified version of the $1/n$ expansion called self-consistent screening approximation, in which the standard $1/n$ expansion is extended to smaller values of n in a self-consistent manner, was made by Jolicoeur [68]. A continuous transition characterized by the exponents different from the standard $O(n)$ exponents was also found, supporting the existence of chiral universality class.

(c) What happens in physically relevant cases $d = 3$ and $n = 2$ or 3?

Now, in view of the $\epsilon = 4 - d$ and $1/n$ expansion results presented in the previous subsections, I wish to consider the physically relevant situation, $d = 3$ and $n = 2$ or 3. Implications from the $1/n$ expansion or its extended version is simple: A new type of continuous transition characterized by the exponents different from those of the standard $O(n)$ exponents is suggested [23,68]. Implications from the $\epsilon = 4 - d$ expansion is more subtle, which was summarized in Fig.8. In the regime $n > n_{\mathrm{I}}(d) = 21.8 - 23.4\epsilon^2 + 7.1\epsilon^3$, there occurs a continuous transition governed by a new chiral fixed point. By contrast, for $n_{\mathrm{I}}(d) > n > n_{\mathrm{III}}(d) = 2 - \epsilon + 1.3\epsilon^2$, there is no stable fixed point in the noncollinear region and the transition is expected to be first order. Finally, for $n < n_{\mathrm{III}}(d)$, the transition is governed by the standard $O(2n)$ Heisenberg fixed point.

At $d = 3$ and $n = 2$ or 3, this last possibility, $i.e.$, the noncollinear transition governed by the $O(2n)$ Heisenberg fixed point, might be excluded, partly because all RG calculations agree in that the borderline value $n_{\mathrm{III}}(d)$ lies below $n = 2$ [23,61,63], but also because such $O(2n)$ Heisenberg behavior has not been seen in extensive Monte Carlo simulations performed on the stacked-triangular antiferromagnets [21,33-37] (Monte Carlo results will be reviewed in the next section).

Continuous vs. first order

Then, the remaining question is whether the transition is continuous governed by the chiral fixed point, or it is first order. Of course, one can also imagine the borderline situation, $i.e.$, the "tricritical" case. Possible tricritical behavior will be discussed separately in the next subsection. The above question is equivalent to determining the fate of the boundary, $n_{\mathrm{I}}(d)$, at $d = 3$. As mentioned, previous authors exposed different opinions about this point. In Ref.23 the present author conjectured that $n_{\mathrm{I}}(3) \leq 2$ by invoking the Monte Carlo results. Antonenko, Sokolov and Varnashev claimed that the transition was first order based on their Borel-Padé estimate, $n_{\mathrm{I}}(3) \sim 3.39$, which was slightly larger than the physical value, $n = 3$ [61]. The series for $n_{\mathrm{I}}(d)$ used in the resummation procedure, however, has only three terms, and as we have seen in the previous subsection in the XY sinusoidal case, it is sometimes dangerous to draw a definite conclusion based on such a short series. At present, it would be fair to say that no definite conclusion could be drawn from the ϵ expansion. Naively, on may feel that the borderline value of n_{I} at the lowest order, $n_{\mathrm{I}}(0) \simeq 21.8$, is large enough as compared with the physical values $n = 2$ or 3 so that one may safely conclude that the transition in real systems is first order. However, the coefficient of the first correction term, 23.4, is also large, which sets the scale of the numerics in this problem. For example, the difference between the Borel-Padé estimate of Ref.61 $n_{\mathrm{I}} \simeq 3.3$ and the physical value $n = 3$ is so

21

small compared with this scale that one can hardly hope to get a reliable answer, especially without the knowledge of the asymptotic behavior of the series.

In this connection, it might be instructive to point out that an apparently similar situation exists in the phase transition of lattice superconductors ($U(1)$ lattice gauge model) with n-component order parameter, where the real system corresponds to $n = 2$ [68]. A RG $\epsilon = 4 - d$ expansion calculation applied to this model yielded a stable fixed point only for very large $n > 183$, below which there was no stable fixed point [69]. Since this border value of $n \sim 183$ was so large compared with the physical value $n = 2$, it was initially concluded that the normal-super transition of charged superconductors should be first order [69]. However, it is now well established through the duality analysis and Monte Carlo simulation that the $n = 2$ superconductor in fact shows a continuous transition of the inverted-XY type [70,71]. So, the low-order $\epsilon = 4 - d$ expansion clearly gives a wrong answer in this case. By contrast, $1/n$ expansion and its modified version (self-consistent screening approximation) correctly yielded a continuous transition [69,72].

Presumably, the only way in which one could get more or less reliable answer from the RG loop expansion is to obtain large-order behavior of the series (large-order perturbation), possibly with a few more terms in the expansion [73]. We leave such a calculation applied to the noncollinear transition to future studies.

It might also be important to point out here that, even when a stable fixed point exists as in the regime (I), a first order transition is still possible depending on the microscopic parameters of the system. This is simply due to the fact that even in the type of the RG flow diagram in Fig.7a the flow could show a runaway only if the initial point representing a particular microscopic system is located *out-side* the domain of attraction of the stable fixed point. This means that, even if one has a few noncollinear systems exhibiting a first-order transition, it does not necessarily exclude the possibility of a group of other noncollinear magnets showing a continuous transition. The difference between these two types of systems is not of symmetry origin, but arises simply from the difference in certain nonuniversal parameters.

One might then hope to get information about the location of the initial point of the RG flows in the parameter space, by mapping the original microscopic spin Hamiltonian into the LGW form. Of course, there usually remains some ambiguities in the procedure because such a mapping also generates higher-order irrelevant terms in the LGW Hamiltonian (various terms higher than sixth order in $\vec{a}$ and $\vec{b}$), which modifies the initial values of the quartic terms u and v somewhat through a few initial RG iterations. Anyway, such a mapping performed in Ref.23 shows that in both cases of stacked-triangular antiferromagnets and helimagnets one has $v_0/u_0 = 4/3$, where u_0 and v_0 are the initial values of quartic coupling constants. In the situation where the chiral fixed point exists at all, this point is likely to

lie *inside* the domain of the fixed point. Indeed, the ratio v/u at the chiral fixed point in the borderline case $n = n_I$ is estimated by the $\epsilon = 4 - d$ expansion as $v_0/u_0 = 3.11 + O(\epsilon)$.

By contrast, there are several models with the same chiral symmetry whose initial point of the RG flow lies outside the domain of attraction of the chiral fixed point. An example may be the matrix $O(2)$ model describing the $n = 2$ noncollinear magnets, in which the noncollinear structure is completely rigid. In this model, the above mapping yields the initial point at $v_0/u_0 = 4$ [74], which is expected to lie *outside* the domain of attraction of the chiral fixed point. Here, recall that the line $v/u = 4$ corresponds to the stability boundary in the mean-field approximation as shown in §4(a), and is likely to lie outside the domain of attraction of any stable fixed point. In fact, a first-order transition was observed for the matrix $O(2)$ model in $d = 3$ dimensions by Monte Carlo simulation [75], consistent with the above argument. In the $O(3)_L \times O(2)_R$ matrix model representing the completely rigid $n = 3$ noncollinear magnets, the above mapping yields $v_0/u_0 = 3$ [74]. For this matrix model in $d = 3$ dimensions, Kunz and Zumbach observed by Monte Carlo simulation a continuous transition with unusual critical exponent $\nu \sim 0.48$ [75]. For the stacked-triangular Heisenberg antiferromagnet, Dobry and Diep observed by Monte Carlo simulation that, if one stiffened the noncollinear $120°$ structure by adjusting some of the exchange constants, the nature of the transition apparently changed significantly [76]. This observation might also be understandable within the above picture, if one regards the initial point of the RG flow moving in the parameter space toward a runaway region as the noncollinear $120°$ spin structure is stiffened.

Since there appears to be a possibility that $n_I(d = 3)$ lies close to the physical values $n = 2$ or 3, it may be interesting to examine what happens if $n_I(3)$ is only very slightly larger than the physical value of n. In this case, although there is no stable fixed point in the strict sense (chiral fixed point becomes complex-valued in this regime), RG flows behave as if there were a stable fixed point for a long period of iterations. Thus, as illustrated in Fig.9, a "shadow" of the chiral fixed point attracts the RG flows up to a certain scale, but eventually, the flow escapes away from such a "pseudo-fixed point" through a narrow channel in the parameter space and shows a runaway signaling a first-order transition. Physically, this means that the system exhibits a rather well-defined critical behavior for a wide range of temperature governed by the complex-valued chiral fixed point, but eventually, the deviation from such critical behavior sets in for sufficiently small t, and the system exhibits a weak first-order transition. This scenario is perhaps close to the 'almost continuous transition' scenario proposed by Zumbach [77,78]. It was suggested there within the local potential approximation of RG that the transition of $n = 3$ noncollinear magnets might be almost continuous with well-defined pseudocritical

exponents.

Possible tricritical behaviors

A few authors have suggested that the $d = 3$ noncollinear transition might be tricritical. More specifically, *mean-field* tricritical behavior was invoked in those works [31,32,36]. It should be noticed, however, that the tricriticality in general is not necessarily mean-field tricritical, particular when the LGW Hamiltonian has more than one quartic coupling as in our model [79]. In this subsection, I will examine the possible tricritical behaviors in the noncollinear transition based on the LGW Hamiltonian (2.4) and the $\epsilon = 4 - d$ expansion picture. Since the word 'tricritical' has sometimes been used in the literature in a rather wide or vague sense, I will try to be unambiguous here what is meant by tricriticality. The two different 'tricritical' cases will be discussed.

The standard tricritical situation is concerned with a separatrix of the RG flows which divides the two regions of the parameter space, one associated with a continuous transition and the other with a first-order transition. In the case where the chiral fixed point is stable, this separatrix is the line connecting the Gaussian fixed point G and the antichiral fixed point C_-, the latter being the tricritical fixed point: See Fig.7a. By its definition, the tricritical fixed point has one more relevant operator in addition to the temperature and the ordering field. Thus, if the initial Hamiltonian happens to lie at a point on this separatrix, RG flow is attracted to the tricritical fixed point C_- and the system exhibits a tricritical behavior governed by the antichiral fixed point C_-. In order to reach this tricritical fixed point, one has to tune one symmetry-unrelated microscopic parameter so that the initial point is just on the separatrix. Since the tricritical fixed point here is not the Gaussian fixed point G, but the nontrivial antichiral fixed point C_-, the associated tricritical exponents are *not* of mean-field tricritical. As usual, a change in certain nonuniversal parameter of the system would induce either a first-order transition or a continuous transition governed by the stable chiral fixed point C_+.

The second 'tricritical' case is concerned with the situation where the physical value of n is just at the borderline value $n = n_I(d)$ between the regimes of continuous and first-order transitions. In this case, the RG flow diagram becomes as given in Fig.10, where the two fixed points C_+ and C_- coalesce at a point in the (u, v) plane. As can be seen in Fig.10, the resulting fixed point, which is again a highly nontrivial one, has a finite domain of attraction in the (u, v) plane and attracts many microscopic Hamiltonians, in contrast to the tricritical fixed point discussed above. Therefore, except for the degenerate nature of the fixed point, the situation is essentailly the same as in the case of $n > n_I(d)$, in the sense that novel critical behavior is expected for a variety of microscopic systems.

Note that, in either case discussed above, the tricritical behavior is highly

nontrivial, *not of mean-field tricritical*. This is simply due to the fact that the tricritical fixed point is a nontrivial one reflecting the existence of more than one quartic coupling constant in the LGW Hamiltonian. Of course, the Gaussian fixed point responsible for the mean-field tricritical behavior always exists at the origin, but to reach this fixed point, one has to tune more than one symmetry unrelated microscopic parameters, and the occurrence of such mean-field tricritical transition is highly unlikely [79].

(e) $\epsilon = d - 2$ expansion

In this subsection, I will review an alternative RG approach, an expansion from the lower critical dimension $d_< = 2$. The application of this method to the noncollinear transition was first made by Azaria, Delamotte and Jolicoeur for the Heisenberg spins ($n = 3$) [31]. Extension to general n-component spins was made by Azaria, Delamotte, Delduc and Jolicoeur [32], and by the present author [80].

Nonlinear sigma model

In contrast to the $\epsilon = 4 - d$ expansion, the $\epsilon = d - 2$ expansion is based on the nonlinear sigma model which is written in terms of spin variables of fixed length. In case of noncollinear magnets with n-component spins, this may be written in terms of two mutually orthogonal n-component vector fields $\vec{a}$ and $\vec{b}$ as

$$\mathcal{H} = \frac{1}{2T}[(\nabla_\mu \vec{a})^2 + (\nabla_\mu \vec{b})^2 + r \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \{\nabla_\mu (a_i b_j - a_j b_i)\}^2], \qquad (4.14a)$$

with the constraints

$$| \vec{a}(\mathbf{r}) | = | \vec{b}(\mathbf{r}) | = 1, \quad \vec{a}(\mathbf{r}) \cdot \vec{b}(\mathbf{r}) = 0, \qquad (4.14b)$$

where T is a temperature and r is a coupling-constant ratio. One can easily check that the above Hamiltonian satisfies the same $O(n) \times O(2)$ symmetry as in the LGW Hamiltonian (2.4). Unlike the case of eq.(2.4), the noncollinear structure, *i.e.*, an orthogonal frame spanned by the two vectors $\vec{a}$ and $\vec{b}$, is completely rigid here. It is not necessarily obvious whether this idealization does not change essential physics in $d = 3$ dimensions (Recall our discussion concerning the stiffness of the noncollinear structure in the previous subsection based on the LGW Hamiltonian).

Fixed points and exponents

The standard $\epsilon = d - 2$ expansion applied to the Hamiltonian (4.14) yields a stable fixed point characterized by the exponents [32,80]

$$\nu = \epsilon - \frac{1}{2}\frac{6n^3 - 27n^2 + 32n - 12}{(n-2)^3(2n-3)}\epsilon^2 + O(\epsilon^3), \qquad (4.15)$$

$$\eta = \frac{3n^2 - 10n + 9}{2(n-2)^3}\epsilon + O(\epsilon^2). \tag{4.16}$$

This fixed point is stable for any $n > 2$ and $d > 2$. In the limit $n \to 2$, the fixed-point temperature tends to infinity and the $\epsilon = d - 2$ expansion becomes meaningless. Azaria *et al* observed that, in the particular case of Heisenberg spins ($n = 3$), the obtained fixed point was nothing but the standard $O(4)$ Wilson-Fisher fixed point [31]. Note that this $O(4)$ fixed point is different in nature from the $O(4)$-like fixed point obtained by Bak and Mukamel in the $\epsilon = 4 - d$ expansion analysis of the XY ($n = 2$) noncollinear magnets: The former fixed point has no counterpart in the $\epsilon = 4 - d$ expansion [4]. By contrast, for $n > 3$, the fixed point obtained by the $\epsilon = d - 2$ expansion is a new one, *not* the standard Wilson-Fisher fixed point. Indeed, for large enough n, various exponents reduce to those obtained by the $1/n$ expansion based on the LGW Hamiltonian [23], naturally fitting into the chiral-fixed point picture obtained by the $\epsilon = 4 - d$ and $1/n$ expansions.

As mentioned, in the Heisenberg ($n = 3$) case, $\epsilon = d - 2$ expansion predicts that the symmetry is dynamically restored, yielding the standard $O(4)$ critical behavior which has never been seen in the $\epsilon = 4 - d$ expansion. Based on this observation, Azaria *et al* claimed that the ($n = 3$, $d = 3$) noncollinear transition should be of standard $O(4)$ universality [31,32]. They further speculated that the transition could also be first order or mean-field tricritical, depending on the microscopic parameters of the system. (Note, however, that the $\epsilon = d - 2$ expansion itself yielded neither first-order nor mean-field tricritical behavior.) So, in the 'nonuniversality' scenario of Ref.31, the noncollinear transition of Heisenberg systems is either $O(4)$, mean-field tricritical, or first order.

Discussion

In fact, as will be shown in the next section, recent extensive Monte Carlo simulations on the stacked-triangular Heisenberg antiferromagnets now rule out the $O(4)$-like critical behavior [31,33,35,37]. Thus, doubt has been cast by several authors to the validity of the $\epsilon = d - 2$ method applied to this problem. In the Heisenberg case ($n = 3$), a different interpretation of the $O(4)$ behavior obtained by the $\epsilon = d - 2$ expansion had already been exposed in Ref.80: It was argued there that the $O(4)$ fixed point for $n = 3$ was spurious, arising from the incapability of the method to deal with the crucially important nonperturbative effects associated with the vortex degrees of freedom, which reflects the nontrivial topological structure of the order-parameter space, $\Pi_1(V = SO(3)) = Z_2$. Essentially the same criticism was also made by Kunz and Zumbach, and by Zumbach in Refs.75 and 81.

By analyzing the properties of another generalization of the $n = 3$ model, $O(n) \times O(n-1)$ nonlinear sigma model, David and Jolicoeur proposed a scenario in which Azaria's $O(4)$ fixed point with enlarged symmetry played no role due to the

appearance of a first-order line in the phase diagram [82]. (Note that the 'principal chiral fixed point' quoted by these authors corresponds to the $O(4)$ fixed point with enlarged symmetry, *not* the chiral fixed point in the present article.) On the other hand, based on their Monte Carlo study of a modified stacked-triangualr Heisenberg antiferromagnet in which the interaction is modified to yield the rigid 120° structure, Dobry and Diep suggested that the nonlinear sigma model used by Azaria *et al* itself might already be inappropriate to model the original stacked-triangular Heisenberg antiferromagnet [76].

While the above criticisms apply specifically to the $n = 3$ noncollinear magnets, it should also be mentioned that there has been a controversy concerning the validity of the $\epsilon = d - 2$ expansion method even in the simplest case of simple $O(n)$ ferromagnets [83]. Anyway, it now appears clear in the present problem that the $\epsilon = d - 2$ expansion method is problematic, at least in the case of $n = 3$. Special care has to be taken in applying this method to the system with nontrivial internal structure in its order-parameter space like the noncollinear magnets.

(f) Further generalization of noncollinear transitions

So far, we have limited our discussion to the magnets with the noncollinear but *coplanar* spin order. On the other hand, in some cases, *noncoplanar* spin orderings that are three-dimensional in spin space could appear. Example is a triple-$\vec{Q}$ ordering as illustrated in Fig.11. One can further generalize the situation to m-dimensional spin order in isotropic n-spin space with $m \leq n$. The $m = 1$ case represents the collinear spin order, while the $m = 2$ case represents the noncollinear but coplanar spin order discussed so far. Then, one can naturally imagine the possible existence of hyperuniversality series characterized by two integers (m, n).

Theoretical analysis of such noncoplanar criticality was first made in 1990 by the present author based on a symmetry argument, RG $\epsilon = 4 - d$ and $1/n$ expansions [84]. An appropriate LGW Hamiltonian with the $O(m) \times O(n)$ symmetry is given by

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{LGW}} = \frac{1}{2}\sum_\alpha (\nabla\vec{\phi}_\alpha)^2 + \frac{1}{2}r\sum_\alpha \vec{\phi}_\alpha^2 + \frac{1}{4!}u(\sum_\alpha \vec{\phi}_\alpha^2)^2 + \frac{1}{4!}v\sum_{<\alpha\beta>}\{(\vec{\phi}_\alpha \cdot \vec{\phi}_\beta)^2 - \vec{\phi}_\alpha^2\vec{\phi}_\beta^2\},$$

(4.17)

where $\vec{\phi}_\alpha$ $(1 \leq \alpha \leq m)$ are m sets of n-component vectors. The condition

$$0 < v < \frac{2m}{m-1}u,$$

(4.18)

is required by the noncoplanarity of the ordering and the boundedness of free energy. The $\epsilon = 4 - d$ expansion applied to (4.17) yields a generalized chiral fixed point in

27

the noncollinear region $v > 0$, which is stable for [84]

$$n > n_{\rm I}(d) = 5m+2+2\sqrt{6(m+2)(m-1)}-\{5m+2+\frac{25m^2+22m-32}{2\sqrt{6(m+2)(m-1)}}\}\epsilon+O(\epsilon^2).$$
(4.19)

For the coplanar ($m = 2$) case, this reduces to the previous result (4.3), while in the noncoplanar ($m = 3$) case, this gives

$$n > n_c(d) = 32.5 - 33.7\epsilon + O(\epsilon^2).$$
(4.20)

Again, it is not easy to tell from this expression whether the noncoplanar ($m = 3$) chiral fixed point remains stable in the physical case, $d = 3$ and $n = 3$.

The exponents γ and ν at this generalized chiral fixed point were calculated as [84]

$$\gamma \approx 2\nu = 1 + \frac{1}{4}B_{mn}(C_{mn} + D_{mn}\sqrt{R_{mn}})\epsilon + O(\epsilon^2),$$

$$B_{mn}^{-1} = (mn + 8)(m + n - 8)^2 + 24(m - 1)(n - 1)(m + n - 2),$$

$$C_{mn} = mn(m + n)^2 + 8mn(m + n) - 22(m + n)^2 + 88mn - 32(m + n) + 152,$$

$$D_{mn} = mn(m + n) - 10(m + n) + 4mn - 4,$$

$$R_{mn} = (m + n - 8)^2 - 12(m - 1)(n - 1).$$
(4.21)

The $1/n$ expansion applied to (4.17) yields a continuous transition characterized by the exponents [84],

$$\gamma = \frac{2}{d - 2}\{1 - 3(m + 1)\frac{S_d}{n}\} + O(\frac{1}{n^2}),$$
(4.22)

$$\nu = \frac{1}{d - 2}\{1 - 4(m + 1)\frac{d - 1}{d}\frac{S_d}{n}\} + O(\frac{1}{n^2}),$$
(4.23)

where S_d was defined by (4.12). Further details including the expression of the chiral crossover exponent were given in Ref.84. (A part of the $\epsilon = 4 - d$ expansion results at the lowest order was also reported in Ref.85, in apparent ignorance of Ref.84.) Anyway, if this generalized chiral fixed point remains stable in $d = 3$, the associated critical behavior is most probably novel. Thus, possible existence of a hyperseries of universality classes characterized by two integers m and n was proposed in Ref.84, where the special case $m = 1$ corresponds to the standard $O(n)$ Wilson-Fisher universality and the case $m = 2$ corresponds to the standard chiral universality.

One possible example of such noncoplanar criticality was studied by Reimers, Greedan and Björgvinsson for pyrochlore antiferromagnet FeF_3 both by neutron-diffraction experiment and by Monte Carlo simulation [86]. The reported exponent

28

values were quite unusual, $\alpha = 0.6(1)$, $\beta = 0.18(2)$, $\gamma = 1.1(1)$ and $\nu = 0.38(2)$, although Mailhot and Plumer argued that the same data were also not inconsistent with a first-order transition [87].

§5 Monte Carlo simulations

(a) Stacked-triangular antiferromagnets

In this section, I wish to review the results of Monte Carlo simulations on the 3D XY and Heisenberg antiferromagnets on a stacked-triangular lattice. Monte Carlo method enables us to study the XY and Heisenberg systems directly in three dimensions. Thus, if one could control finite-size effects and statistical errors intrinsic to the method, one could get useful information which might serve to test various theoretical proposals.

Partly for simplicity and partly to get a wide critical regime, most of extensive Monte Carlo simulations on the stacked-triangular antiferromagnets were performed on the nearest-neighbor Hamiltonian (2.1) with $J = J'$. Earlier work by the present author simulated the lattices up to $L = 60^3$ both for XY and Heisenberg models based on the conventional method [21], while more recent simulations on the XY model by Plumer and Mailhot [36], by Boubcheur, Loison and Diep [34], and those on the Heisenberg model by Bhattacharya, Billoire, Lacaze and Jolicoeur [33], by Mailhot, Plumer and Caillé [37], and by Loison and Diep [35] used the histogram technique, the largest lattice sizes being $L = 33 \sim 48$. As an example, the temperature and size dependence of the specific heat calculated in Ref.21 is reproduced in Fig.12. In the numerical sense, the results obtained by these independent simulations agreed with each other except for a small deviation left in some exponents in the XY case. All authors observed a continuous transition both for the XY and Heisenberg cases, except for a recent simulation by Mailhot and Plumer on a *quasi-one-dimensional* stacked-triangular XY antiferromagnet [88].

The values of critical exponents, specific-heat amplitude ratio and transition temperature reported by these authors are summarized in Table II and III for both cases of XY and Heisenberg models, and are compared with the corresponding values of unfrustrated XY and Heisenberg ferromagnets, of the standard $O(4)$ behavior, and of the mean-field tricritical behavior. One can immediately see that the exponent values determined by these simulations differ significantly from the unfrustrated XY or Heisenberg values. One can also see that the reported exponents are incompatible with the $O(4)$ exponents both in the XY and Heisenberg cases, which were predicted by Bak and Mukamel in the XY case [4] and by Azaria *et al* in the Heisenberg case [31]. Indeed, the $O(4)$ singularity is weaker than that of the standard XY and Heisenberg singularity, contrary to the observed tendency. Based on these findings, one may now rule out the standard $O(4)$-like critical behavior in

both cases of XY and Heisenberg magnets. In the Heisenberg case, the reported exponents are also inconsistent with the mean-field tricritical values suggested by Azaria *et al* [31], and give support to the claim that the $n = 3$ noncollinear transition is indeed of new $n = 3$ chiral universality.

In the XY case, one sees from the table that the reported exponent values are not much different from the mean-field tricritical values. Furthermore, a closer look reveals that there remains small difference in the exponent values reported by three different groups. All agree concerning the exponent β which comes around 0.25. By contrast, concerning the exponent γ, the reported values are scattered as 0.99 ± 0.02 (Ref.34), 1.13 ± 0.05 (Ref.21) and 1.15 ± 0.05 (Ref.36). The reason of this deviation is not clear. In fact, the exponent values reported by Plumer and Mailhot in Ref.34 were very close to the mean-field tricritical values, and these authors suggested that the transition in the XY case might indeed be mean-field tricritical. In contrast to this, finite-size scaling analysis in Ref.21 favored the nontrivial exponents, rather than the mean-field tricritical exponents.

Meanwhile, larger deviations from the mean-field values were observed in the chirality exponents β_κ and γ_κ and the specific-heat amplitude ration A^+/A^-. In the mean-field tricritical case governed by the Gaussian fixed point, these values should be $\beta_\kappa = 0.5$, $\gamma_\kappa = 0.5$ and $A^+/A^- = 0$, while the Monte Carlo results of Ref.21 yielded $\beta_\kappa = 0.45 \pm 0.02$, $\gamma_\kappa = 0.77 \pm 0.05$ and $A^+/A^- = 0.36 \pm 0.2$ in the XY case, and $\beta_\kappa = 0.55 \pm 0.04$, $\gamma_\kappa = 0.72 \pm 0.08$ and $A^+/A^- = 0.54 \pm 0.2$ in the Heisenberg case. These nontrivial values of the chirality exponents and the specific-heat amplitude ratio appear to be hard to explain from the mean-field tricritical scenario. The observed chirality exponents satisfy the scaling relation (4.7) within the error bars.

In Ref.34, Plumer and Mailhot suggested a possibility that the chirality and the spin are decoupled and order at slightly different temperatures, $T_c \neq T_c^{(\kappa)}$, and/or with mutually different correlation-length exponents, $\nu \neq \nu_\kappa$. From the standard theory of critical phenomena, however, this is a rather unlikely situation in the present 3D problem due to the following reason. If the chirality were decoupled from the spin and exhibited an independent transition, the criticality associated with this chirality transition is expected to be of 3D Ising universality, which then should give $\beta_\kappa \sim 0.324$, $\gamma_\kappa \sim 1.239$ and $\nu_\kappa \sim 0.629$ *etc*. However, this clearly contradicts the Monte Carlo results. Even if the criticality of the decoupled chirality transition were to differ from the standard Ising one due to some unknown reason, the chiral susceptibility exponent γ_κ in such a case should definitely be larger than unity, which again seems hard to reconcile with the Monte Carlo results $\gamma_\kappa = 0.77 \pm 0.05$ [21] or $\gamma_\kappa = 0.90 \pm 0.09$ [34]. Rather, the Monte Carlo observation that $T_c \sim T_c^{(\kappa)}$ and $\nu \sim \nu_\kappa$, together with the non-Ising values of the chirality exponents is a clear indication that the spin and the chirality are *not* decoupled and the chirality behaves

as a composite operator of the order parameter, the spin. In fact, this is just a scenario suggested from the RG analysis in §4(b) [23]. Note that, in such a situation, the chirality exponents are generally non-Ising and the chiral susceptibility exponent γ_κ could be less than unity, in accord with the Monte Carlo results. As long as the spin and the chirality are not decoupled at the transition, the observed nontrivial values of the chirality exponents are unambiguous indications that the transition here is *not* of mean-field tricritical.

Monte Carlo simulation is performed for finite systems (in the present case, $L \leq 60^3$), and one cannot completely rule out the possibility that a sign of first-order transition eventually develops for still larger lattices. Mailhot and Plumer recently performed a histogram Monte Carlo simulation of a quasi-one-dimensional stacked-triangular XY antiferromagnet in which the interplane interaction is much stronger than the intraplane interaction ($J' = 10J$) for lattice sizes up to $L = 33^3$, and claimed that the transition was weakly first order [88]. More specifically, these authors estimated the transition temperature by two different methods which gave somewhat different estimates of T_c (about 0.5% difference). If a higher estimate of T_c was employed in the fit, finite-size scaling of the data was suggestive of a first-order transition, while if a lower estimate of T_c was employed, it was suggestive of a continuous transition with the exponents close to the previous works [34]. In view of the rather large uncertainty in their estimate of T_c as well as high sensitivity of the results on the assumed T_c value, and also of the fact that they never observed a double-peak structure in the energy histogram characteristic of a first-order transition [88], the claimed first-order nature of the transition appears not necessarily conclusive. One should also be careful that, in highly anisotropic systems like the one studied in Ref.88, there generally occurs a dimensional crossover which might complicate the data analysis particularly when the system size is not large enough.

(b) helimagnets

While the stacked-triangular antiferromagnets are the best studied model, there are a few Monte Carlo works on 3D helimagnets (spiral magnets). Diep simulated a helimagnetic model with the competing nearest- and next-nearest-neighbor antiferromagnetic interactions on a body-centered-tetragonal lattice under periodic boundary conditions [89]. In the case of Heisenberg spins, Diep observed a continuous transition characterized by the exponents $\alpha = 0.32 \pm 0.03$ and $\nu = 0.57 \pm 0.02$, which were not far from the $n = 3$ chiral values obtained for the stacked-triangular Heisenberg antiferromagnet. In the case of XY spins, he observed either two successive continuous transitions or a first-order transition, depending on the microscopic parameters of the model.

One potential problem exists, however, in the simulation of helimagnets of this type. Namely, unlike the 120° spin structure in the triangular antiferromagnets, the

pitch of magnetic spiral is generally *temperature dependent* and is *incommensurate* with the underlying lattice. Therefore, imposed periodic boundary conditions, even if they are chosen to accommodate the ground-state spin configuration without mismatch, generally causes a mismatch around T_c causing an artificial "stress" on the helical spin structure. This could give a significant effect on the nature of phase transition [90], particularly when the lattice size is not large enough compared with the spiral pitch.

(c) Matrix models

Finally, several matrix models expected to model the noncollinear magnets were also studied by Monte Carlo simulations. Hamiltonian of these matrix models may be given by

$$\mathcal{H} = -J \sum_{<ij>} \text{Tr}(O_i^T O_j), \tag{5.1}$$

where O_i is a matrix variable at the $i-$th site of a simple cubic lattice and $J > 0$ is the ferromagnetic nearest-neighbor coupling. Relevant to our present study is the matrix $O(2)$ model representing the noncollinear XY magnets, where the matrix variable O_i is a 2×2 orthogonal matrix, and the matrix $O(3)_L \times O(2)_R$ model representing the noncollinear Heisenberg magnets, where O_i is a 3×2 matrix written in terms of two orthogonal unit three-vectors, $\vec{a}$ and $\vec{b}$, as $(\vec{a}, \vec{b})$.

In the $O(2)$ case, the model has an $O(2)_L \times O(2)_R$ symmetry and is also equivalent to the coupled Ising-XY model of the form

$$\mathcal{H} = -J \sum_{<ij>} (1 + \sigma_i \sigma_j) \cos(\theta_i - \theta_j), \tag{5.2}$$

where $\sigma_i = \pm 1$ is an Ising variable and $\theta_i = [0, 2\pi)$ is an angle variable of the XY spin.

As mentioned, these matrix models represent completely rigid noncollinear spin structures. Analysis in §4 suggests that these models, particularly the matrix $O(2)$ model, are likely to exhibit a first-order transition since the initial point of the associated RG flow might be located in the runaway region in the parameter space. Indeed, Monte Carlo simulations by Kunz and Zumbach [75], and by Dobry and Diep [76], on these and related models revealed that the 3D matrix models exhibited a first-order transition, or the behavior close to it.

As pointed out by Zumbach [78], the matrix O(2) model shows an interesting transition behavior *even at the mean-field level*, significantly different from that of stacked-triangular antiferromagnets with the non-rigid noncollinear spin structures: It exhibits a mean-field tricritical transition with the exponents $\alpha = 1/2$, $\beta = 1/4$ and $\gamma = 1$, which should be contrasted to ordinary mean-field exponents $\alpha = 0$,

32

$\beta = 1/2$ and $\gamma = 1$ observed when the mean-field approximation is applied to the XY and Heisenberg stacked-triangular antiferromagnets. By contrast, the $O(3)_L \times O(2)_R$ matrix model modeling the rigid Heisenberg noncollinear magnets exhibits an ordinary mean-field transition at the mean-field level [78]. These observations suggest that the nature of the transition of the matrix models or the coupled Ising-XY model may not always be the same as those of original noncollinear magnets with the nonrigid noncollinear spin structures, even when both share the same symmetry.

§6. Experiments

In this section, we briefly review the recent experimental results both on (a) stacked-triangular antiferromagnets and (b) helimagnets (spiral magnets). Since some review articles with emphasis on experimental works are already available [42,44], I summarize here some of the main features and highlight the points of interest.

(a) Stacked-triangular antiferromagnets

The best studied material of the stacked-triangular XY antiferromagnets is $CsMnBr_3$, for which specific-heat measurements (exponent α and amplitude ratio A^+/A^-) [26,27] and neutron-scattering measurements (exponents β, γ and ν) [24,25,39] were made independently by several groups. The reported values of the exponents and the specific-heat amplitude ratio are summarized in Table IV. As an example, the specific-heat data reported in Ref.27 and the sublattice-magnetization data reported in Ref.24 were reproduced in Figs.13 and 14, respectively. All authors reported a continuous transition. In particular, high-precision specific-heat measurements gave a stringent upper limit to the possible latent heat, demonstrating continuous nature of the transition. Another example of the well-studied $n = 2$ chiral system is $CsNiCl_3$ under high magnetic fields, for which the measured exponents are also included in Table IV [91-93]. Although $CsNiCl_3$ is a weakly Ising-like magnet, under external fields higher than a certain value H_m corresponding to the multicritical point, it exhibits a single transition directly from the paramagnetic state to an "umbrella-type" noncollinearly-ordered state with the nontrivial chirality. This is caused because applied fields generate an effective planar anisotropy perpendicular to the field, which cancels and exceeds the intrinsic axial anisotropy. Overall, as can be seen from Table IV, the experimental results support the chiral-universality prediction. It should also be noticed that the measured exponents β, γ and ν are not far from the mean-field tricritical values, although the observed ν marginally favors the nontrivial $n = 2$ chiral value. By contrast, the specific-heat

exponent α and the amplitude ratio A^+/A^- more or less favor the chiral-universality values over the mean-field tricritical values.

Relatively well studied Heisenberg-like stacked-triangular antiferromagnets are VCl_2 [29], VBr_2 [28,30], $RbNiCl_3$ [94-96] as well as $CsNiCl_3$ in an external field corresponding to the multicritical point $(H = H_m)$ [91-93]. Note that the former three compounds are nearly Heisenberg systems, possessing a weak axial magnetic anisotropy. The measured values of the exponents and the specific-heat amplitude ratio are summarized in Table V. Except for a relatively large deviation observed in the exponent β and γ for VCl_2, the results are consistent with with $n = 3$ chiral values. Since the high-precision specific-heat measurement for VBr_2 yielded results in good agreement with the theoretical $n = 3$ chiral values, it might be interesting to examine the critical properties of VBr_2 by neutron scattering to measure β, γ and ν.

Other stacked-triangular XY antiferromagnets studied are $RbMnBr_3$ and $CsCuCl_3$. Unlike the compounds quoted above, the lattice structures of these compounds around T_c are distorted from the perfect simple hexagonal lattice. $RbMnBr_3$ exhibits an incommensurate spin order with its turn angle equal to $128°$ [97], presumably due to its distorted lattice structure [45,46]. Concerning the critical properties associated with the incommensurate spin order of $RbMnBr_3$, a theoretical argument was given that the critical behavior would be the same chiral one as in undistorted $CsMnBr_3$ if the lattice deformation of $RbMnBr_3$ is of certain type [45]. Indeed, for $RbMnBr_3$, Kato et al gave $\alpha = 0.42\pm0.16$, $\alpha' = 0.22\pm0.06$ and $A^+/A^- = 0.30\pm0.02$ by birefringence measurements [98], and $\beta = 0.28\pm0.02$ by neutron-diffraction measurements [99], in reasonable agreement with the expected $n = 2$ chiral values.

By contrast, the lattice structure of $CsCuCl_3$ is distorted such that the anisotropic Dzyaloshinski-Moriya interaction $-\vec{D}_{ij}\cdot\vec{S}_i\times\vec{S}_j$ arises between the neighboring spins along the c-axis, the associated D-vector pointing to the directions slight off the c-axis [100]. Along the c-axis, the directions of these D-vectors rotate around the c-axis with the period of six lattice spacings. If the D-vector were precisely parallel with the c-axis, the spin symmetry would be chiral, $i.e.$ $O(2) = Z_2 \times SO(2)$, where Z_2 concerns the chiral degeneracy associated with the noncollinear spin structure in the $triangular$ $layer$. However, the canting of the D-vector from the c-axis reduces the spin symmetry from the perfect chiral one to the lower one, $i.e.$, only Z_2 associated with the spin inversion. Thus, a crossover from the $n = 2$ chiral critical behavior is expected in its magnetic transition in a close vicinity of T_c [44]. In that sense, $CsCuCl_3$ is not an ideal material to study the chiral criticality.

The magnetic phase transition of $CsCuCl_3$ was recently studied by neutron diffraction by Mekata et al [101], by Stüsser et al [102], and by specific-heat measurements by Weber et al [103]. Mekata et al obtained $\beta = 0.25\pm0.01$ while Stüsser et al obtained [102] $\beta = 0.23 \pm 0.02$, which were close to the $n = 2$ chiral value

and that of CsMnBr$_3$. By contrast, Weber *et al* observed in the temperature range $10^{-3} < |t| < 5 \times 10^{-2}$ a power-law scaling behavior in the specific heat characterized by $\alpha = 0.35 \pm 0.05$ and $A^+/A^- = 0.29 \pm 0.05$ close to the $n = 2$ chiral values, but observed a deviation from this scaling behavior in a closer vicinity of T_c. This deviation was interpreted by these authors as a sign of first-order transition. It was further suggested that this might indicate the failure of chiral universality. It should be noticed, however, that due to the reduction of spin symmetry caused by the canting of its D-vector from the c-axis CsCuCl$_3$ is not an ideal material to study the $n = 2$ chiral criticality, and the observed deviation from the $n = 2$ chiral critical behavior might possibly be caused by the expected crossover effect, not being an intrinsic property of an ideal $n = 2$ chiral magnet. Experimental observation reported in Ref.103 that external fields applied along the c-axis made the deviation from the ideal chiral critical behavior less pronounced can naturally be understood from such crossover picture, because the c-axis field tends to confine the noncollinear spin structure in a plane orthogonal to the field, thus relatively weakening the crossover due to the canting effect of the D-vector.

One should also note that, as emphasized in §4(c), theory leaves enough room for the occurrence of a first-order transition even when there exists a chiral universality class. Hence, observation of first-order transition in a few noncollinear magnets is not quite enough to rule out the possible existence of chiral universality class in generic noncollinear transitions.

(b) helimagnets

In this subsection, I wish to review experimental situation for helimagnets (spiral magnets). So far, experimental studies of the critical properties of these helimagnets have been limited almost exclusively to rare-earth helimagnets, Ho, Dy and Tb. As mentioned in the Introduction, experimental situation for these rare-earth helimagnets has remained confused. Different authors reported considerably different values for the same exponent of the same material, and the reason of this discrepancy has not been clear. Here, I donot intend to give a comprehensive review of various experimental works, but rather highlight several points of the most severe conflict, discuss its possible origin and propose possible ways to disentangle the present confusion. For detailed review of the experimental works on rare-earth helimagnets, we refer the reader to Ref.16.

Let us begin with a survey of the present experimental status. Most authors reported that the paramagnetic-helimagnetic transition of Ho, Dy and Tb was continuous.

Exponent α and specific-heat amplitude ratio A^+/A^-

Several high-precision specific-heat measurements have been done on Ho, Dy

and Tb. For Dy, Ledermann and Salamon reported a crossover from the behavior characterized by $\alpha = -0.02 \pm 0.01$ and $A^+/A^- = 0.48 \pm 0.02$ ($10^{-2.3} < t < 10^{-0.5}$) to the behavior characterized by $\alpha = 0.18 \pm 0.08$ and $A^+/A^- = 0.44 \pm 0.04$ ($10^{-3.3} < t < 10^{-2.3}$) [7]. Jayasuriya and coworkers gave $\alpha = 0.27 \pm 0.02$ and $A^+/A^- = 1.78 \pm 0.45$ for Ho [104], $\alpha = 0.24 \pm 0.02$ and $A^+/A^- = 0.41 \pm 0.05$ for Dy [105], and $\alpha = 0.20 \pm 0.03$ and $A^+/A^- = 0.58 \pm 0.34$ for Tb [106]. Jayasuriya *et al* noticed that the values of α and A^+/A^- changed somewhat depending on the fitting form and the temperature range used in the fit. For Ho, Wang, Belanger and Gaulin gave $\alpha = 0.10 \pm 0.02$ and $A^+/A^- = 0.51 \pm 0.06$ ($0.002 < t < 0.1$), or $\alpha = 0.22 \pm 0.02$ and $A^+/A^- = 0.61 \pm 0.07$ ($0.002 < t < 0.1$), depending on the particular form of the fitting formula [26]. They also reported that the observed critical behavior could not be well fitted with a single exponent. All measurements quoted above agreed in that the transition was continuous. Although there exists considerable scatter among the reported values of α and A^+/A^-, a tendency appears clear: The exponent α tends to be larger than the standard $O(n)$ values and that there is a crossover-like behavior which hinders the data to lie on a single power-law behavior in the temperature range studied.

There were also several attempts to extract the specific-heat exponent from some other physical quantities such as electrical resistivity [107]. Since the validity of such procedure was questioned by some authors [105], I quoted here only the results of direct specific-heat measurements.

Exponent β

The exponent β has been measured by neutron, X-ray and Mösbauer techniques. While all authors agreed in that the transition was continuous, the reported values of β were scattered wildly as 0.21 (Tb; X-ray), 0.23 (Tb; neutron), 0.25(Tb; neutron), 0.3(Ho; neutron), 0.335(Dy; Mösbauer), 0.37(Ho; X-ray), 0.38(Dy; neutron), 0.39(Ho; neutron) to 0.39(Dy; neutron). It is not easy to read off a systematic tendency from this. Some of the values, particularly β for Tb, were close to the $n = 2$ chiral value, but other values, especially those obtained by neutron and X-ray diffraction for Ho and Dy tend to give much larger values close to the $O(4)$ value.

Exponent γ and ν

The exponents γ and ν have been measured by neutron and X-ray scatterings. Neutron-scattering measurements by Gaulin, Hagen and Child gave $\gamma = 1.14 \pm 0.04$ $\nu = 0.57 \pm 0.04$ for Ho, and $\gamma = 1.05 \pm 0.07$, $\nu = 0.57 \pm 0.05$ for Dy, which were close to the $n = 2$ chiral values [108]. More recent X-ray and high-precision neutron-scattering studies on Ho by Thurston and coworkers revealed interesting new features [109]. Critical scattering above T_N actually consisted of two components characterized by mutually different exponents: A broad component characterized

36

by the exponents $\nu = 0.55 \pm 0.04$ and $\gamma = 1.24 \pm 0.15$, which was associated with the bulk contribution inside the sample, and a narrow component characterized by the exponents $\nu = 1.0 \pm 0.3$ and $\gamma = 3.4 \sim 4.5$, which came from the skin part of the sample. High-precision neutron-scattering for Tb also established the existence of such two length scales [110]. Exponents associated with the broad component were in agreement with the earlier measurements. Exponents associated with the narrow component was explained by Altarelli *et al* [111] as governed by the long-range disorder fixed point [112], on the assumption that the skin layer of Ho contains a number of edge-dislocation dipoles. Anyway, these experiments have clearly shown that, in order to get the bulk critical properties from the measurements sensitive to the defected skin layer, special care has to be taken to extract the bulk component from the signal.

First-order transition?

As mentioned, a few authors claimed that their experimental data for Ho and Dy were suggestive of a weak first-order transition [11,12]. Probably, first experimental claim that the transition in Ho might be weakly first order was made by Tindal, Steinitz and Plumer based on their thermal expansion measurements of Ho along the a axis [11]. These authors observed a jump-like anomaly in the thermal expansivity along the a axis, although no such anomaly was detected along the c axis. Tindall *et al* interpreted this anomaly as an evidence of a first-order transition. Later thermal-expansion measurements by White on Ho along the a-axis, however, lead to the opposite conclusion that the transition was continuous [113], and the situation remains unclear. Putting aside such discrepancy among independent measurements, an apparent jump-like behavior observed by Tindal *et al* appears to be explained by the standard power-law singularity characteristic of a continuous transition of the form,

$$\Delta a/a \approx b_0 + b_1 t + c_\pm \mid t \mid^{1-\tilde{\alpha}}, \quad t \equiv (T - T_N)/T_N,$$

if $b_0 > 0$, $b_1 > 0$, $c_+ < 0$ *and* $c_- > 0$, as long as the exponent $\tilde{\alpha}$, usually identified as the specific-heat exponent α, is positive. Note that the coefficients $c_\pm$ could be negative even if the total thermal expansivity is to be positive. Hence, the data of Ref.11 cannot be regarded as an unequivocal proof of first-order transition.

While earlier thermal-expansion measurements on rare-earth metals Dy and Tb observed a continuous transition [114], Zachowski *et al* suggested that the paramagnetic-helimagnetic transition of Dy might also be first order based on their observation of deviation from a single power-law scaling behavior in an immediate vicinity of T_N [12]. Care has to be taken in this interpretation, however, since apparent deviation from the scaling behavior in a vicinity of T_N could arise from

many secondary effects, such as rounding due to impurities or inhomogeneities, insufficiency of temperature control, crossover of yet unidentified nature, or even the contribution from the defected skin layer, *etc.* Therefore, in order to experimentally conclude that the transition is really first order, one should give a reliable lower bound to the discontinuity of some physical quantity at the transition, such as finite latent heat. At present, there appears to be no such firm experimental evidence of first-order transition.

Discussion

As shown, experimental data of rare-earth metals are sometimes mutually conflicting. Below, I wish to try to discuss the possible cause of the conflict together with its possible resolution.

One point to be remembered is that the magnetic interaction in these rare-earth metals is the long-range RKKY interaction whose range is of order the pitch of the helix. It means that, when one is far away from T_N and the correlation length is smaller than the helix pitch, one should have the ordinary mean-field critical behavior characterized by $\alpha = 0$, $\beta = 0.5$ and $\gamma = 1$ *etc* [26]. Only when one further approaches T_N and the correlation length gets longer, one should have a true asymptotic critical behavior. If one assumes that the asymptotic critical behavior is also of $n = 2$ chiral universality, one expects a mean-field to $n = 2$ chiral crossover, $\alpha = 0 \to 0.34$, $\beta = 0.5 \to 0.25$, $\gamma = 1 \to 1.13$ *etc.* In fact, this scenario appears to account for many of the experimental results. For example, earlier specific-heat measurements by Ledermann and Salamon [7] where the data exhibited a crossover from a smaller α value to a larger α value appears consistent with this scenario. In case of γ, since the mean-field value $\gamma = 1$ and the $n = 2$ chiral value $\gamma \simeq 1.13$ happen to be rather close, this crossover would be hard to detect clearly, which is also consistent with experiment [108].

Another important ingredient might be the possible contribution from the defected skin part of sample as discussed above. While the contribution from the skin part is separable above T_N by analyzing the lineshape of the scattering function [109,110], such separation is not straightforward below T_N since both the bulk and the skin contributions yield resolution-limited Bragg peaks. This means that the Bragg intensity observed so far is likely to be a superposition of these two distinct components, each with different exponents β. If one assumes the above scenario, the bulk component exhibits a crossover from $\beta = 0.5$ (ordinary mean-field) to $\beta \simeq 0.25$ ($n = 2$ chiral), while, according to Ref.111, the skin component exhibits a behavior governed by the long-range disorder fixed point characterized by $\beta = 0.5$. So, rather complicated situation might indeed occur in rare-earth metals, and special care has to be taken in extracting information about the asymptotic bulk critical behavior. To my knowledge, experimental analysis fully taking account of such complication

has not yet been done especially below T_N. Thus, it is highly desirable to extract the bulk component *below T_N* by separating the contribution of the skin component by some experimental device.

One possible experiment to bypass the above complications might be to study *insulating* helimagnets. There is at least one candidate material, VF_2, which is known to exhibit a paramagnetic-helimagnetic transition [115]. Since the magnetic interaction in VF_2 is *short-ranged*, one need not worry about the slow crossover from the mean-field behavior, and hopefully, the effect of defected skin part would be less severe. If so, information about the critical properties of VF_2 would be valuable to disentangle the present complicated situation concerning helimagnets, and I wish to urge experimentalists to try such experiments.

So, one plausible scenario proposed here is that the asymptotic criticality of helimagnets is also of $n = 2$ chiral universality as in the case of stacked-triangular antiferromagnets, which is blurred and masked by the slow crossover from the ordinary mean-field behavior caused by the long-range RKKY interaction as well as by the contribution of the defected skin part of sample. Of course, this hypothesis should be tested by experiments, some of which have been proposed above.

(c) *Measurements of chirality*

Chirality is a quantity playing an important role in the noncollinear transitions. Hence, it is of great interest to experimentally measure the chirality. Since the chirality is a multispin variable of higher order in the original spin variables, its direct experimental detection needs some ingenuity. Plumer, Kawamura and Caillé pointed out that, if one could prepare a sample with a single chiral domain, the average total chirality $\bar{\kappa}$ could be measured by using polarized neutrons [116]. These authors also suggested that a single chiral domain might be prepared by cooling the sample under applied electric fields. Experimental attempt along this direction was made by Visser *et al* [117]. Maleyev suggested that the chirality might be observable by measuring the polarization dependent part of neutron scattering in applied magnetic fields [118]. Federov *et al* suggested that the chirality sense might be controlled by applying the elastic torsion, which could be used to prepare a single chiral-domain sample [119]. To the author's knowledge, however, these methods and ideas have not yet be fully substantiated. Direct experimental detection of chirality is certainly a challenging problem, which may serve to provide new experimental tool to look into the noncollinear orderings.

§7. Critical and multicritical behaviors under magnetic fields

In this section, I will review the phase transition of stacked-triangular antiferromagnets under applied magnetic fields. Let us first begin with the case of

unfrustrated collinear antiferromagnets on bipartite lattices. Typical magnetic field - temperature phase diagrams of such weakly anisotropic antiferromagnets are illustrated in Fig.15 for the cases of axial (Ising-like) anisotropy with field applied along an easy axis (a), and for the case of planar (XY-like) anisotropy with field applied in an easy plane (b). Axial magnets in a field exhibit a multicritical point, termed bicritical point, at which two critical lines and a first-order spin-flop line meet: See Fig.15a. Critical properties of these axial magnets along the critical lines and at the bicritical point were theoretically studied by Fisher and Nelson [120], and by Kosterlitz, Nelson and Fisher [121], with the results given in Fig.15. The criticalities are of standard $O(n)$ universality with $n = 1, 2, 3$. Applying a scaling theory, Fisher *et al* derived various predictions, which were supported by subsequent experiments [122]. It thus appears that the critical and the multicritical behaviors of unfrustrated collinear antiferromagnets in a field are now fairly well understood.

In the case of frustrated noncollinear antiferromagnets such as stacked-triangular antiferromagnets, typical magnetic phase diagrams are shown in Fig.16 for the cases of axial (Ising-like) anisotropy with field applied along an easy axis (a), and for the case of planar (XY-like) anisotropy with field applied in an easy plane (b). In the axial case, three critical lines and a first-order spin-flop line meet at a new type of multicritical point at (T_m, H_m): See Fig.16a. In the planar case, two distinct critical lines meet at a zero-field multicritical point, termed tetracritical point: See Fig.16b.

Such novel features of the phase diagrams and the multicritical behaviors of stacked-triangular antiferromagnets were first observed experimentally. In the axial case, phase diagram with a novel multicritical point was found by Johnson, Rayne and Friedberg in 1979 for $CsNiCl_3$ by means of susceptibility measurements [38], while in the planar case phase diagram with a zero-field tetracritical point was determined by Gaulin *et al* in 1989 for $CsMnBr_3$ by means of neutron-scattering measurements [39]. Subsequent phenomenological free-energy analysis successfully reproduced the main qualitatative features of these phase diagrams [123,124]. These multicritical behaviors in a field were also reproduced by subsequent Monte Carlo simulations [125-127].

Scaling analysis of the critical and the multicritical properties of stacked-triangular antiferromagnets under magnetic fields was made by Kawamura, Caillé and Plumer based on the chiral-universality scenario [40,79]: According to this scaling theory, in the axial case, the criticality along the two low-field critical lines is of standard XY universality, while the one along the high-field critical line is of $n = 2$ chiral universality. Meanwhile, the multicritical behavior right at the multicritical point is predicted to be of $n = 3$ chiral universality. In the planar case, the criticality along the higher-temperature critical line is of XY universality, while the one along the lower-temperature critical line is of Ising universality. The mul-

40

ticritical (tetracritical) behavior at the zero-field transition point is of $n = 2$ chiral universality governed by the $n = 2$ chiral fixed point.

Scaling theory further predicted that, in the axial case, three critical lines should merge at the multicritical point tangentially with the first-order spin-flop line as [40]

$$\mid H - H_m \mid \propto \mid T - T_m \mid^\phi, \tag{7.1}$$

where the exponent $\phi \sim 1.06$ is common among the three critical lines. In fact, ϕ is the anisotropy-crossover exponent at the $n = 3$ chiral fixed point identified in the RG analysis in §4(b).

Similarly, in the planar case, it is predicted that the two critical lines in external fields should merge at the zero-field tetracritical point as [40]

$$H^2 \propto \mid T - T_m \mid^\phi, \tag{7.2}$$

where $\phi \sim 1.04$ is the anisotropy-crossover exponent at the $n = 2$ chiral fixed point, common between the two critical lines. Near the tetracritical point, the zero-field uniform susceptibility was predicted to behave as [40,42,79]

$$\chi(T, H = 0) \approx C_\pm \mid T - T_m \mid^{-\tilde{\gamma}} + [\text{less singular and regular parts}], \tag{7.3}$$

where $\tilde{\gamma} = -(2 - \alpha - \phi) \sim -0.56$.

These scaling predictions were tested by subsequent experiments. In the axial case, criticality along the three critical lines as well as at the multicritical point were examined by several authors. In particular, the predicted $n = 2$ chiral behavior along the high-field critical line as well as the $n = 3$ chiral behavior at the multicritical point were very well confirmed by specific-heat measurements by Beckmann, Wosnitza and von Löhneysen on CsNiCl$_3$ [91], by birefringence measurements by Enderle, Furtuna and Steiner on CsNiCl$_3$ and CsMnI$_3$ [92], and by neutron-diffraction measurements by Enderle, Schneider, Matsuoka and Kakurai on CsNiCl$_3$ [93]. The behavior of the phase boundaries near the multicritical point was investigated by Poirier *et al* for CsNiCl$_3$, who found by means of ultrasonic velocity measurements that the low-temperature low-field critical line between the collinear and noncollinear phases (regions 2 and 3 in Fig.17) exhibited a 'turnover' in a close vicinity of the multicritical point to merge into the first-order spin-flop line, as shown in Fig.17 [128]. This turnover behavior was not expected by the mean-field theory, but in accord with the scaling prediction. Katori, Goto and Ajiro [129], and Asano *et al* [130] determined by magnetization measurements the phase diagrams of other axial stacked-triangular antiferromagnets CsNiBr$_3$ and CsMnI$_3$, and emphasized universal aspects of the phase diagrams.

Along the two low-field critical lines, theory expects the standard XY critical behavior. Experimentally, the critical properties at these two transition points were

studied in zero field by several methods, including NMR [131], neutron scattering [132] for $CsNiCl_3$, neutron scattering [133,134] and specific heat [135] for $CsMnI_3$. Most of the results are consistent with the expected XY criticality, although significant deviation was observed in a few cases such as the exponents γ and ν reported in Ref.134. A part of such deviation may be ascribed to the proximity effect of the $n = 3$ chiral behavior realized at the multicritical point at $H = H_m$.

In the planar case, the situation is not entirely satisfactory. Concerning the behavior of the two critical lines near the zero-field tetracritical point, Gaulin et al reported by neutron scattering for $CsMnBr_3$ the crossover exponents $\phi_{P-II} \sim 1.21$ and $\phi_{II-I} \sim 0.75$ for the high- and low-temperature critical lines, respectively, which differed considerably from the scaling results, $\phi_{P-II} = \phi_{II-I} \sim 1$. Reanalysis of the data by Gaulin, however, revealed that, once the uncertainty of T_m was taken into account in the analysis, the experimental data were not inconsistent with the scaling results [42]. Goto, Inami and Ajiro found by magnetization measurements $\phi_{P-II} = 1.02 \pm 0.05$ and $\phi_{II-I} = 1.07 \pm 0.05$ for $CsMnBr_3$ [136], which were in good agreement with the theoretical values. By contrast, markedly smaller values, $\phi_{P-II} = 0.78 \pm 0.06$ and $\phi_{II-I} = 0.79 \pm 0.06$, were reported by Tanaka, Nakano and Matsuo for the XY stacked-triangular antiferromagnet $CsVBr_3$ by susceptibility measurements [137], while the values, $\phi_{P-II} = 0.76 \pm 0.1$ and $\phi_{II-I} = 0.81 \pm 0.1$, were reported by Weber, Beckmann, Wosnitza and von Löhneysen for $CsMnBr_3$ by specific-heat measurements [138]. The cause of this discrepancy is not clear. From theoretical side, although the prediction that the exponent ϕ is common among the critical lines is a direct consequence of the chiral-universality picture, its precise value is still subject to large uncertainties, because it has not yet been determined by reliable numerical methods such as extensive Monte Carlo simulation. It is thus desirable to give a more reliable numerical estimate of the anisotropy-crossover exponent ϕ.

It turns out that the zero-field transition point of $RbMnBr_3$ is also a tetracritical point in the magnetic field – temperature phase diagram [139-141]. The associated crossover exponents were determined by Heller et al by means of neutron scattering as 1.00 ± 0.35 and 1.07 ± 0.25, for the higher-temperature and the lower-temperature critical lines, respectively [141].

The zero-field susceptibility of $CsMnBr_3$ was measured by Mason, Stager, Gaulin and Collins [142]. These authors interpreted their data as being inconsistent with the scaling prediction on the assumption that the coefficients of the leading singularity, $C_\pm$ in eq.(7.3), were both positive and that the contribution from the regular and less singular terms were zero. However, once one properly takes account of the fact that the sign of $C_\pm$ could be different on both sides of T_m and that there generally exists a finite contribution from the regular and less singular terms, the experimental data are consistent with the scaling theory [42,79].

§7. Summary

Recent theoretical and experimental studies on phase transitions of noncollinear or canted magnets, including both stacked-triangular antiferromagnets and helimagnets, were reviewed with particular emphasis on the novel critical and multicritical behaviors observed in these magnets.

Theoretical analyses based on various renormalization-group techniques, which usually gave good results for standard unfrustrated magnets, have given somewhat inconclusive and sometimes conflicting results concerning the nature of the noncollinear transitions. Special care appears to be necessary in applying the standard RG methods to the system with nontrivial structure in the order-parameter space as in the present problem. Nevertheless, as was discussed in detail in §4, most plausible possibility suggested from the RG analyses is either the transition is continuous governed by a new fixed point (chiral universality), or else, the transition is first order.

Most of the recent extensive Monte Carlo simulations performed on XY and Heisenberg stacked-triangular antiferromagnets suggest the occurrence of a continuous transition characterized by the exponents significantly different from the standard $O(n)$ exponents. In that sense, these Monte Carlo results support the chiral-universality scenario. the bulk of various experiments on stacked-triangular XY and Heisenberg antiferromagnets have also yielded results in favor of the chiral-universality scenario: A continuous transition characterized by the novel exponents close to those obtained by Monte Carlo simulations has been observed. Meanwhile, in the case of XY spins, many of the Monte Carlo and experimental results also appear to be marginally consistent with the mean-field tricritical behavior, while such behavior is not suggested by some of the data such as the specific-heat exponent, specific-heat amplitude ratio and chirality exponents. From a theoretical viewpoint, the mean-field tricritical behavior dictated by the trivial Gaussian fixed point is rather unlikely even when the system happens to be just at its tricriticality, as long as the generic noncollinear criticality is *not* of the standard $O(n)$ universality. Thus, at least in the case of stacked-triangular antiferromagnets, there appears to be reasonable evidence both from Monte Carlo simulations and experiments that a new chiral universality class is in fact realized.

There still seems to exist a slight chance of a weak first-order transition, though, either from Monte Carlo simulations or from experiments. Although this point is to be examined, it seems already clear from recent extensive studies that there exists a rather wide and well-defined critical regime, say at $10^{-1} > t > 10^{-3}$, characterized by a set of novel critical exponents and amplitude ratio, *which are universal among various noncollinear magnetic materials and model systems*. This observation strongly suggests *the existence of an underlying novel fixed point governing the noncollinear criticality*. The remaining possibility is that this fixed point may

be slightly complex-valued. It is certainly interesting to further examine the order of the transition both from careful numerical simulations and from high-precision experiments, either to get an unambiguous evidence of first-order transition or to push the limit of continuous nature of the transition further away. To do this experimentally, one needs to choose appropriate materials which do not have a weak perturbative interaction which breaks the chiral symmetry. In addition, to be sure that the transition is first order, one should give a reliable lower bound on the discontinuity of some physical quantities such as the latent heat. Mere observation of deviation from a simple power-law behavior in a close vicinity of T_N is not quite enough to conclude that the transition is first order, since such deviation could arise from many secondary effects. Also one should recognize that, even when there exists a well-defined chiral universality class, it is completely possible that some systems sharing the same chiral symmetry exhibit first-order transition due to the difference in nonuniversal details of certain microscopic parameters.

In contrast to stacked-triangular antiferromagnets, the present situation in helimagnets (spiral magnets) is less clear. In particular, experimental situation for rare-earth helimagnets has been confused for years now. I have proposed one possible scenario to solve this confusion based on the chiral-universality scenario, where the combined effects of the long-range nature of the RKKY interaction and the contribution from the defected skin part hinder the observation of an ideal chiral critical behavior. It might be interesting to test the proposal by further experiments. On numerical side, it might be interesting to perform further Monte Carlo simulations on helimagnets by paying attention to the effects of boundary conditions.

To sum up, phase transitions of frustrated noncollinear magnets exhibit novel behaviors different from standard unfrustrated collinear magnets. Although there is not a complete consensus among researchers, many of both experimental and numerical results on stacked-triangular antiferromagnets point to the occurrence of phase transitions of new chiral universality class, distinct from the standard $O(n)$ Wilson-Fisher universality class. As a reflection of richer structure of its order parameter, the noncollinear transitions also possess some unique physical quantities such as chirality which have no counterpart in the standard unfrustrated magnets. Such rich inner symmetry also leads to unique magnetic phase diagrams in external fields with novel multicritical behaviors. In this decade, there has been a stimulating and fruitful interplay between theory and experiment in the area. Hopefully, further theoretical as well as experimental works will clarify novel features of the noncollinear transitions, which might serve to enlarge and deepen our understanding of phase transitions and critical phenomena.

References

[1] Villain J 1977 Phys. C**10** 4793

[2] Miyashita S and Shiba H 1985 J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **53** 1145

[3] Kawamura H and Miyashita S 1984 J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **53** 4138

[4] Bak P and Mukamel D 1976 Phys. Rev. B**13** 5086

[5] Garel T and Pheuty P 1976 J. Phys. C**9** L245

[6] Eckert J and Shirane G 1976 Solid State Comm. **19** 911

[7] Lederman E L and Salamon M B 1974 Solid State Comm. **15** 1373

[8] Loh E, Chien C L and Walker J C 1974 Phys. Letters A**49** 357

[9] Dietrich O W and Als-Nielsen J 1967 Phys. Rev. **162** 315

[10] Barak Z and Walker M B 1982 Phys. Rev. B**25** 1969

[11] Tindall D A, Steinitz M O and Plumer M L 1977 J. Phys. F**7** L263

[12] Zachowski S W, Tindall D A, Kahrizi M, Genossar J and Steinitz M O 1986 J. Magn. Magn. Mater. **54-57** 707

[13] Tang C C, Stirling W G, Jones D L, Wilson C C, Haycock P W, Rollason A J, Thomas A H and Fort D 1992 J. Magn. Magn. Mater. **103** 86

[14] Tang C C, Haycock P W, Stirling W G, Wilson C C, Keen D and Fort D 1995 Physica B**205** 105

[15] Thurston T R, Helgesen G, Hill J P, Gibbs D, Gaulin B D and Simpson P J 1994 Phys. Rev. B**49** 15730

[16] Du Plesis P, Venter A M and Brits G H F 1995 J. Phys. Condens. Matter **7** 9863

[17] Du Plesis P, van Doorn C F and van Delden D C 1983 J. Magn. Magn. Mater. **40** 91

[18] Brits G H F and Du Plesis P 1988 J. Phys. F**18** 2659

[19] Kawamura H 1985 J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **54** 3220; 1987 J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **56** 474

[20] Kawamura H 1986 J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **55** 2095; 1989 J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **58** 584

[21] Kawamura H 1992 J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **61** 1299

[22] Kawamura H 1988 J. Appl. Phys. **63** 3086

[23] Kawamura H 1988 Phys. Rev. B**38** 4916; 1990 Phys. Rev. B**42** 2610(E)

[24] Mason T E, Collins M F and Gaulin B D 1987 J. Phys. C**20** L945; 1989 Phys. Rev. B**39** 586

[25] Ajiro Y, Nakashima T, Unno Y, Kadowaki H, Mekata M and Achiwa N 1988 J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **57** 2648; Kadowaki H, Shapiro S M, Inami T and Ajiro Y 1988 J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **57** 2640

[26] Wang J, Belanger D P and Gaulin B D 1991 Phys. Rev. Lett. **66** 3195

[27] Deutschmann R, Löhneysen H v, Wosnitza J, Kremer R K and Visser D 1992 Europhys. Lett. **17** 637

[28] Takeda K, Uryû N, Ubukoshi K and Hirakawa K 1986 J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **55** 727

[29] Kadowaki H, Ubukoshi K, Hirakawa K, Martinéz J L and Shirane G 1988 J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **56** 4027

[30] Wosnitza J, Deutschmann R, Löhneysen H v and Kremer R K 1994 J. Phys. Condens. Matter **6** 8045

[31] Azaria P, Delamotte B and Jolicoeur Th 1990 Phys. Rev. Lett. **64** 3175

[32] Azaria P, Delamotte B, Delduc F and Jolicoeur Th 1993 Nucl. Phys. B**408** 485

[33] Bhattacharya T, Billoire A, Lacaze R and Jolicoeur Th 1994 J. Phys. I *France* **4** 181

[34] Boubcheur E H, Loison D and Diep H T 1996 Phys. Rev. B**54** 4165

[35] Loison D and Diep H T 1994 Phys. Rev. B**50** 16453

[36] Plumer M L and Mailhot A 1994 Phys. Rev. B**50** 16113

[37] Mailhot A, Plumer M L and Caillé A 1994 Phys. Rev. B**50** 6854

[38] Johnson P B, Rayne J A and Friedberg S A 1979 J. Appl. Phys. **50** 583

[39] Gaulin B D, Mason T E, Collins M F and Larese J Z 1989 Phys. Rev. Lett. **62** 1380

[40] Kawamura H, Caillé A and Plumer M L 1990 Phys. Rev. B**41** 4416

[41] Kawamura H 1992 in *Recent Advances in Magnetism of Transition Metal Compounds*, edited by A. Kotani and N. Suzuki (World Scientific, Singapore) p.335

[42] Gaulin B D 1994 in *Magnetic Systems with Competing Interactions* edited by H.T. Diep (World Scientific, Singapore) p.286

[43] Plumer M L, Caillé A, Mailhot A and Diep H T, 1994 in *Magnetic Systems with Competing Interactions* edited by H.T. Diep (World Scientific, Singapore) p.1

[44] Collins M F and Petrenko O A 1997 Can. J. Phys. **75** 605

[45] Kawamura H 1990 Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **101** 545

[46] Zhang W, Saslow W M and Gabay M 1991 Phys. Rev. B**44** 5129; Zhang W, Saslow W M, Gabay M and Benakli M 1993 Phys. Rev. B**48** 10204

[47] Jones D R T, Love A and Moore M A 1976 J. Phys. C**9** 743

[48] Bailin D, Love A and Moore M A 1977 J. Phys. C**10** 1159

[49] Joynt R 1991 Europhys. Lett. **16** 289; 1993 Phys. Rev. Lett. **71** 3015

[50] Granato E and Kosterlitz J M 1990 Phys. Rev. Lett. **65** 1267

[51] Toulouse G and Kléman M 1976 J. de Phys. Lett. **37** 149; Mermin N D 1979 Rev. Mod. Phys. **51** 591

[52] Kosterlitz J M and Thouless D J 1973 J. Phys. C**6** 1181; Kosterlitz J M 1974 C**7** 1046

[53] Lee D H, Jonnopoulos J D, Negele J W and Landau D P 1984 Phy. Rev. Lett. **52** 433; 1986 Phys. Rev. B**33** 450

[54] Teitel S and Jayaprakash C 1983 Phys. Rev. B**27** 598

[55] Ramirez-Santiago G and José J V 1992 Phys. Rev. Lett. **68** 1224; 1994 Phys. Rev. **49** 9567 and references therein

[56] Olsson P 1995 Phys. Rev. Lett. **75** 2758 and references therein

[57] Wintel M, Everts H U and Apel W 1995 Phys. Rev. B**52** 13480

[58] Kawamura H and Kikuchi M 1993 Phys. Rev. B**47** 1134

[59] Southern B W and Xu H-J 1995 Phys. Rev. B**52** R3836

[60] Kohring G, Shrock R E and Wills P 1986 Phys. Rev. Lett. **57** 1358; Williams G 1987 Phys. Rev. Lett. **59** 1926; Shenoy S R 1989 Phys. Rev. B**40** 7212

[61] Antonenko S A, Sokolov A I and Varnashev K B 1995 Phys. Lett. A**208** 161

[62] Mudrov A I and Varnashev K B 1997 cond-mat/9712007; 1998 cond-mat/9802064.■

[63] Antonenko S A and Sokolov A I 1994 Phys. Rev. B**49** 15901

[64] Cowley R A and Bruce A D 1978 J. Phys. C**11** 3577

[65] Shpot N A 1989 Phys. Lett. **142** 474

[66] Kawamura H unpublished

[67] Kawamura H 1988 Phys. Rev. B**38** 960

[68] Jolicoeur Th 1995 Europhys. Lett. **30** 555

[69] Halperin B I, Lubensky T C and Ma S K 1974 Phys. Rev. Lett. **32** 292

[70] Dasgupta C and Halperin B I 1981 Phys. Rev. Lett. **47** 1556

[71] Olsson P and Teitel S 1997 cond-mat/9710200 and references therein

[72] Radzihovsky L 1995 Europhys. Lett. **29** 227

[73] Kleinert H, Thomas S and Schote-Frohline V 1996 quant-ph/9611050 and references therein

[74] Kawamura H unpublished

[75] Kunz H and Zumbach G 1993 J. Phys. A**26** 3121

[76] Dobry A and Diep H T 1995 Phys. Rev. **51** 6731

[77] Zumbach G 1993 Phys. Rev. Lett. **71** 2421

[78] Zumbach G 1994 Phys. Lett. A**190** 225; 1994 Nucl. Phys. B**413** 771

[79] Kawamura H 1993 Phys. Rev. B**47** 3415

[80] Kawamura H 1991 J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **60** 1839

[81] Zumbach G 1995 Nucl. Phys. B**435** 753

[82] David F and Jolicoeur Th 1996 Phys. Rev. Lett. **76** 3148

[83] See, for example, Castilla G E and Chakravarty S 1993 Phys. Rev. Lett. **71** 384; 1997 Nucl. Phys. B**485** 613 and references therein

[84] Kawamura H 1990 J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **59** 2305

[85] Saul L 1992 Phys. Rev. B**46** 13847

[86] Reimers J N, Greedan J E and Björgvinsson M 1992 Phys. Rev. B**45** 7295

[87] Mailhot A and Plumer M L 1993 Phys. Rev. B**48** 9881

[88] Plumer M L and Mailhot A 1997 J. Phys. Condens. Matter **9** L165

[89] Diep H T 1989 Phys. Rev. B**39** 397

[90] Saslow W M, Gabay M and Zhang W 1992 Phys. Rev. Lett. **68** 3627

[91] Beckmann D, Wosnitza J and Löhneysen H v 1993 Phys. Rev. Lett. **71** 2829

[92] Enderle M, Furtuna G and Steiner M 1994 J. Phys. Condens. Matter **6** L385

[93] Enderle M, Schneider R, Matsuoka Y and Kakurai K 1997 Physica B**234-236** 554

[94] Yelon W B and Cox D E 1972 Phys. Rev. B**6** 204

[95] Oohara Y, Kadowaki H and Iio K 1991 J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **60** 393

[96] Oohara Y, Iio K and Tanaka H 1991 J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **60** 4280

[97] Eibshütz E, Sherwood R, Hsu F L and Cox D E 1972 AIP Conf. Proc. **17** 684

[98] Kato T, Iio K, Hoshino T, Mitsui T and Tanaka H 1992 J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **61** 275

[99] Kato T, Asano T, Ajiro Y, Kawano S, Ishii T and Iio K 1995 Physica, B**213** & **214** 182

[100] Tanaka H, Iio K and Nagata K 1985 J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **54** 4345

[101] Mekata M, Ajiro Y, Sugino T, Oohara A, Ohara K, Yasuda S, Oohara S and Yoshizawa H 1995 J. Magn. Magn. Mater. **140 - 144** 38

[102] Schotte U, Stuesser N, Schotte K D, Weinfurter H, Mayer H M and Winkelmann M 1994 J. Phys. Condens. Matter **6** 10105; Stuesser N, Schotte U, Schotte K D and Hu X 1995 Physica B**213** & **214** 164

[103] Weber H B, Werner T, Wosnitza J and Löhneysen H v 1996 Phys. Rev. B**54** 15924

[104] Jayasuriya K D, Campbell S J and Stewart A M 1985 J. Phys. F**15** 225

[105] Jayasuriya K D, Campbell S J and Stewart A M 1985 Phys. Rev. B**31** 6032

[106] Jayasuriya K D, Stewart A M, Campbell S J and Gopal E S R 1984 J. Phys. F**14** 1725

[107] See, *e.g.*, Balberg I and Maman A 1979 Physica B**96** 54

[108] Gaulin B D, Hagen M and Child H R 1988 J. Phys. (Paris) Colloq. **49** 327

[109] Thurston T R, Helgesen G, Gibbs D, Hill J P, B.D. Gaulin and G. Shirane, 1993 Phys. Rev. B**70** 3151

[110] Gehring P M, Hirota K, Majkrzak C F and Shirane G 1993 Phys. Rev. Lett. **71** 1087; Hirota K, Shirane G, Gehring P M and Majkrzak C 1994 Phys. Rev. B**49** 11967

[111] Latarelli M, Núnez-Rugueiro M D and Papoular M 1995 Phys. Rev. Lett. **74** 3840

[112] Weinrib A and Halperin B I 1983 Phys. Rev. B**27** 413

[113] White G K 1989 J. Phys. C**1** 6987

[114] Tindall D A and Steinitz M O 1983 J. Phys. F**13** L71

[115] Stout J W and Boo W O J 1966 J. Appl. Phys. **37** 966; Stout J W and Lau H Y 1967 J. Appl. Phys. **38** 1472; Lau H Y, Stout J W, Koehler W C and Child H R 1969 J. Appl. Phys. **40** 1136

[116] Plumer M L, Kawamura H and Caillé A 1991 Phys. Rev. B**43** 13786

[117] Visser D, Coldwell T R, McIntyre G J, Graf H, Weiss L, Zeiske Th and Plumer M L 1994 Ferroelectrics **162** 147

[118] Maleyev S V 1995 Phys. Rev. Lett. **75** 4682

[119] Fedorov V I, Gukasov A G, Kozlov V, Maleyev S V, Plakhty V P and Zobkalo I A 1997 Phys. Lett. A**224** 372

[120] Fisher M E and Nelson D R 1974 Phys. Rev. Lett. **32** 1350

[121] Kosterlitz J M, Nelson D R and Fisher M E 1976 Phys. Rev. B**13** 412

[122] See, for example, King A R and Rohrer H 1979 Phys. Rev. B**19** 5864

[123] Plumer M L, Hood K and Caillé A 1988 Phys. Rev. Lett. **60** 45

[124] Plumer M L and Caillé A 1990 Phys. Rev. B**41** 2543

[125] Mailhot A, Plumer M L and Caillé A 1993 Phys. Rev. B**48** 15835

[126] Mason T E, Collins M F and Gaulin B D 1990 J. Appl. Phys. **67** 5421

[127] Plumer M L and Caillé A 1990 Phys. Rev. B**42** 10388

[128] Poirier M, Caillé, A and Plumer M L 1990 Phys. Rev. B**41** 4869

[129] Katori H A, Goto T and Ajiro Y 1993 J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **62** 743

[130] Asano T, Ajiro Y, Mekata M, Aruga Katori H and Goto T 1994 Physica B**201** 75

[131] Clark R H and Moulton W G 1972 Phys. Rev. B**5** 788

[132] Kadowaki H, Ubukoshi K and Hirakawa K 1987 J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **56** 751

[133] Ajiro Y, Inami T and Kadowaki H 1990 J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **59** 4142

[134] Kadowaki H, Inami T, Ajiro Y, Nakajima K and Endoh Y 1991 J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **56** 1708

[135] Beckmann D, Wosnitza J, Löhneysen H v and Visser D 1993 J. Phys. Condens. Matter **5** 6289

[136] Goto T, Inami T and Ajiro Y 1990 J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **59** 2328

[137] Tanaka H, Nakano H and Matsuo S 1994 J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **63** 3169

[138] Weber H, Beckmann D, Wosnitza J and Löhneysen H v 1995 Int. J. Mod. Phys. B**9** 1387

[139] Kawano S, Ajiro Y and Inami T 1992 J. Magn. Magn. Mater. **104-107** 791

[140] Kato T, Ishii T, Ajiro Y, Asano T and Kawano S 1993 J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **62** 3384

[141] Heller L, Collins M F, Yang Y S and Collier B 1994 Phys. Rev. B**49** 1104

[142] MasonT E, Stager C V, Gaulin B D and Collins M F 1990 Phys. Rev. B**42** 2715

Figure captions

Fig.1 Ground-state spin configuration of three Ising spins on a triangle coupled antiferromagnetically. Frustration leads to the nontrivial degeneracy of the ground state.

Fig.2 Ground-state spin configuration of three vector spins on a triangle coupled antiferromagnetically. Frustration leads to the noncollinear or canted ordered state. In the case of $n = 2$-component XY spins, the ground state is twofold degenerate according as the the noncollinear spin structure is either right- or left-handed, each of which is characterized by the opposite chirality.

Fig.3 Chiral degeneracy in the ordered state of the XY antiferromagnet on the triangular lattice.

Fig.4 Chiral degeneracy in the ordered state of the XY helimagnet.

Fig.5 Representations of "instability points", solid and open circles, in wavevector space for (a) ferromagnets, (b) antiferromagnets on bipartite lattices, (c) stacked-triangular antiferromagnets, and (d) helimagnets. The dashed lines outline the first Brillouin zone. Double lines represent the reciprocal lattice vectors $\vec{K}$: As usual, points connected by $\vec{K}$ should be fully identified.

Fig.6 Mean-field phase diagram in the (u, v) plane of the LGW Hamiltonian (2.4), where u and v are two quartic coupling constants. On the line $v = 4u$, the transition to the noncollinear state is of mean-field tricritical.

Fig.7 Renormalization-group flows in the (u, v) plane obtained by the $\epsilon = 4 - d$ expansion for the LGW Hamiltonian (2.4). Parts (a)-(d) correspond to the regimes I-IV specified in the text. The hatched regions represent basins of attraction of the stable fixed point. In (a), the line connecting the Gaussian fixed point G and the unstable antichiral fixed point C_- is the tricritical line corresponding to the separatrix between the two regions in the parameter space, one associated with a continuous transition (hatched region) and the other with a first-order transition.

Fig.8 Stability regions in the (n, d) plane, with $\epsilon = 4 - d$, of fixed points accessible in the noncollinear region $v > 0$.

Fig.9 Renormalization-group flows in the (u, v) plane in the noncollinear region $v > 0$, expected when n is only slightly smaller than $n_{\mathrm{I}}(d)$. There remains a "shadow" of the slightly complex-valued chiral fixed point which attracts the flows up to a certain scale. Eventually, all flows show runaway, signaling a weak first-order transition.

Fig.10 Renormalization-group flows in the (u, v) plane in the noncollinear region $v > 0$ just at $n = n_{\mathrm{I}}(d)$. The hatched regions represent basins of attraction of the

stable fixed point. The fixed point C is doubly degenerate, C_+ and C_-. It is a nontrivial fixed point with a finite domain of attraction in the (u, v) plane.

Fig.11 Illustration of noncoplanar spin orderings like the ones realized in triple-$\vec{Q}$ structures in type-I (above) and in type-II(below) fcc antiferromagnets.

Fig.12 Temperature and size dependence of the specific heat calculated by Monte Carlo simulation of the stacked-triangular (a) XY and (b) Heisenberg antiferromagnets with L^3 spins. The data are taken from Ref.21. The insets exhibit the size dependence of the specific-heat peak.

Fig.13 Specific heat versus reduced temperature $|\, t \,|$ of the stacked-triangular XY antiferromagnet CsMnBr$_3$, taken from Ref.27. The inset shows the specific heat in a linear representation.

Fig.14 Magnetic Bragg intensity of the $(1/3, 1/3, 1)$ reflection measured by neutron diffraction for the stacked-triangular XY antiferromagnet CsMnBr$_3$ plotted versus reduced temperature. The data are taken from Ref.25.

Fig.15 Schematic magnetic field (H) versus temperature (T) phase diagram of weakly anisotropic unfrustrated antiferromagnet on a bipartite lattice; (a) axial magnet in a field applied along an easy axis; (b) planar magnet in a field applied in an easy plane.

Fig.16 Schematic magnetic field (H) versus temperature (T) phase diagram of weakly anisotropic frustrated antiferromagnet on a stacked-triangular lattice; (a) axial magnet in a field applied along an easy axis; (b) planar magnet in a field applied in an easy plane.

Fig.17 Magnetic phase diagram of the axial stacked-triangular antiferromagnet CsNiCl$_3$ near the multicritical point as determined by sound-velocity measurements. Labeled regions 1-4 refer to the four phases in Fig.16b. The data are taken from Ref.128.

Table captions

Table 1 Order-parameter spaces and the associated homotopy groups for various continuous spin system in two dimensions.

Table 2 Critical exponents, amplitude ratio and transition temperature as determined by several Monte Carlo simulations on the stacked-triangular XY antiferromagnet with $J = J'$. Maximum lattice size used in each simulation is also shown. Corresponding values given by several theories are also shown.

Table 3 Critical exponents, amplitude ratio and transition temperature as determined by several Monte Carlo simulations on the stacked-triangular Heisenberg antiferromagnet with $J = J'$. Maximum lattice size used in each simulation is also shown. Corresponding values given by several theories are also shown.

Table 4 Critical exponents and amplitude ratio determined by experiments on several stacked-triangular XY antiferromagnets. The values given by several theories are also shown.

Table 5 Critical exponents and amplitude ratio determined by experiments on several stacked-triangular Heisenberg (or nearly Heisenberg) antiferromagnets. The values given by several theories are also shown. Note that VCl_2, VBr_2 and $RbNiCl_3$ possess a weak Ising-like anisotropy, which leads to a small splitting of the transition temperature (35.80K and 35.88K in case of VCl_2; 11.11K and 11.25K in case of $RbNiCl_3$). Since the fully isotropic critical behavior should be interrupted due to the anisotropy sufficiently close to T_N, one should note that the reported exponents may be affected somewhat by the crossover effect.